

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIX.

APRIL, 1915.

No. 2.

SCRIPTURE PROOF IN THE VIEW OF MODERNISTS.

That the views which modern critical theologians hold of the origin of the Scriptures practically destroy both the causative and the normative authority of the Bible, and render it useless—except in a secondary manner—for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, has been pointed out long ago by the opponents of modernism. It was reasonably claimed that men could not consistently collect proof-texts for divine things from the only Book in which those things are propounded, if they do not believe that Book to be divinely originated and divinely effectual. With the passing of the old Bible, plenarily inspired and inerrant, the old *Schriftbeweis* must go; the support is knocked from under systematic theology; the study of Bible-history becomes a study of Hebrew folklore, and preaching from Bible-texts an act of pious reverence for the past.

What Bible Christians have anticipated and feared is declared with appalling candor by a representative of the critical school of modern Protestant theology. At the “January Conference” at Dorpat Prof. Dr. Karl Girsengrohn, of the local university, spoke to the pastors present on “Scripture Proof, Formerly and Now, in Evangelical Dogmatics.”¹⁾ He beholds “a grave inner crisis” in Protestantism, “so powerful and thorough that disinterested bystanders—Catholic critics and

1) *Der Schriftbeweis in der evangelischen Dogmatik einst und jetzt.*
Leipzig, 1914.

radical spirits like Eduard von Hartmann and his followers unite in this view—believe themselves justified in speaking of a disintegration and gradual dissolution of Protestantism.” In our country this crisis is exhibited by Catholic spokesmen under the name of “decadent Protestantism.” While formerly Protestant theologians had to defend particular and specified points of doctrine against individual critics, modern Bible-criticism has launched a war against Protestantism that is to crush the Protestant Scripture-principle.²⁾ The historicocritical method of Scripture-interpretation, with every new publication that it issues, renders it more difficult and impossible to derive eternally valid norms from Scripture.

The gravity of the situation is not always recognized. Some imagine that they can meet the critical onslaughts “with the harmless instrument of apologetics on a small scale.” Others declare themselves personally convinced that they occupy an impregnable position, and that the fundamental problem of modernism does not disturb them. Still, many evangelical theologians are showing signs of uneasiness. Such as still declare emphatically that there is nothing the matter with Protestant theology, nevertheless reveal, by the great expenditure of artificial force in their declarations and by their frequent repetition, that they are perturbed. Intelligent laymen who have come under the spell of modernism feel the tension between the modern scientific spirit and the old evangelical Scripture principle so strongly that they begin to speak disparagingly of the Bible, manifest animosity toward the Church, and cast aside the evangelical faith of their childhood. Popular agitators are carrying the claims of modernism, frequently in coarse forms, into the plebeian masses, and while they do not succeed in making these people see the real force of the contention, they beget in them an instinctive sensation of unrest. “The number of simple and sincere believers in the Bible is

2) “um Sein oder Nichtsein des protestantischen Schriftprinzips.”
(p. 3.)

decreasing everywhere, and there is but meager success attending the efforts to supplant them by congregations that have inwardly overcome the crisis." (p. 4 f.)

There is a great deal of talk about better times coming. The need of religion is being strongly felt,—a harbinger of a new revival of religion. In philosophy there is a tendency to metaphysical speculation, and the current is setting strongly toward idealism. Still, these movements are not turning into the traditional church-channels. The churches remain empty, even when there is a "liberal" preacher. When the claims of certain optimists are sifted, there is little of fact found to support them.

Four possibilities have suggested themselves to Dr. Girgensohn for overcoming the crisis that has been caused by the collision of the traditional faith in the Bible within the evangelical churches with the modern scientific spirit of illuminism: 1. Theology and the Church may regain the lost ground, drive the hostile forces out of present-day cultural life, and supplant the illusive, merely human, enlightenment by one of a strictly churchly and Biblical character; 2. theology and the Church may be utterly destroyed; an era free from dogma, purely human enlightenment, purely human ethics, the worship of nature and of humanity, may be introduced. Either of these possibilities has this in its favor that it is radical and thorough-going. There is nothing done by halves along either of these two lines. However, Dr. Girgensohn thinks that there is no prospect of either of these possibilities ever being realized. Accordingly, he approaches the solution by way of a synthesis of the opposing forces, and discovers these additional possibilities: 3. Modern enlightenment may secure a dominant position and endeavor to save what it can of the old Bible-faith, *viz.*, anything that admits of being reconciled with modern scientism; or 4. the old Bible-faith may gain the ascendancy by rejecting all teachings that invite an easy and destructive attack from scientists, and by taking over from the sciences anything that does not contradict the traditional faith.

In his detailed argument on these four possibilities, Dr. Girgensohn discards the second as not worthy of being entertained by a theologian. Thus there remain three possibilities. We are interested chiefly in his first possibility.

The old orthodox attitude toward the Bible, Dr. Girgensohn thinks, cannot be restored. True, there still are a few groups of Christians—some of them not so diminutive in size either—who boast the old Bible-faith. They are a strange company.³⁾ Theologians possessing a complete scientific training there are none among them. It is useless to argue with them. It would be carrying coal to Newcastle to try to convince them of the untenableness of their belief. They should be piously tolerated. Their old orthodox views will collapse as soon as they enter the current of modern thought.

Another orthodox group has begun to realize its weakness, but they refuse to frankly and cordially acknowledge it. They are still hankering after the flesh-pots of the old orthodox dogmatics. For the sake of maintaining outward harmony they prudently adapt themselves to those differing from them. At the same time they are hoping in their heart of hearts that this whole modern scientism may some day be proved a colossal humbug. They carefully note the collapse of a theory and the disintegration of schools of thought and the forming of new ones out of the old, and they fail to see that in each case it is Beelzebub that is driving out Satan. These people wield a great deal of influence in church-circles, and there are among them quite respectable scholars, with up-to-date information on all questions. They know the modern scientific methods of thought, and apply them to a degree, thus giving to their literary productions quite a modern appearance. They all concede that the old orthodox doctrine of inspiration must be discarded. Nevertheless, these people are inwardly sworn enemies of modernism. Whenever modern scientific thoughts

3) "Allen ihren Vertretern haftet gegenueber dem modernen Leben eine eigentuemliche Wirklichkeitsfremdheit an."

force them to draw a conclusion which is inconvenient to their real mind, they will sidestep the issue. They are, for this reason, admirers of the solidarity of Roman Catholics and of the determined rigor of the Roman Catholic church-government in its dealings with modernists.

Dr. Girsengohn claims that he can appreciate and appropriate much that is being said and done by these men, but avers that he can never adopt their "program of reprimandation." Why not? In the first place, he finds that no attempt to reprimand the orthodox past has really and truly reproduced that past. The neo-Lutheran confessionalism of Hengstenberg, Tholuck, and the Erlangen school is not identical with the old orthodox system of doctrine. Even Philippi reveals an advance in thought beyond the sixteenth century.

In the second place, the old evangelical dogmatics aimed only at exhibiting in the utmost purity the teaching of Scripture and to champion the same with all force. But the Scriptures simply cannot be interpreted in our day as they were three hundred years ago. The cosmology of the Bible, literally understood, is become antiquated since Copernicus. Modern research has by its minute and accurate investigation lighted up matters that were commonly regarded as inexplicable mysteries and as miracles. In the third place, the scientific method of our day has necessitated a different valuation of the historical records of the past. The easy faith of former ages in anything written or printed is gone. Nowadays, the critical student subjects each witness of the past to cross-examination: Is he a credible witness? Did he see the things he should have seen? Was he capable to undertake his literary task? etc.

Nor is it only in matters pertaining to nature-study where modern thought clashes with Bible-thought. It touches the Biblical plan of salvation. Such ideas as a preexistence in heaven, a coming down from heaven and a return thither, a descent to hell, are in Scripture locally circumstanced. Modern science has proved that in the places indicated in the Scriptures there

is no heaven or hell, at least not such a heaven or hell as the Scriptures picture. And to make heaven and hell illocal, to interpret these terms as signifying states or conditions, is not doing full justice to the respective passages of Scripture. Moreover, the question as to the credibility of the Biblical writers affects the Christ. Can it be historically proved that He existed? Dr. Gиргенсон thinks it can, however, by a very laborious process and with no mathematical certainty.

Add to this that the man of to-day is confronted with problems of which his forefathers, still less the Biblical writers, never dreamed, and it is evident that a new understanding of the Bible must be inaugurated, and this will necessitate a corresponding transformation of the doctrines gleaned from the Bible as understood by the fathers. We cannot reverse the wheel of time. A riddance of all difficulties might be attempted by a heroic measure: The theological faculties might be purged of all adherents to modern science; "modern" pastors might be forced out of office; "new-Protestant" laymen might be compelled to secede from the Church; theological students might be forbidden certain books, etc. Thus quiet might be restored where there is now a wordy war, however, only for a season. The modern spirit will not brook repression. Witness Rome! Her leaders are employing these heroic measures, but even her powerful means are not sufficient to overcome modernism. Truth crushed to earth will rise again.

With us our reader will inquire: Has this scientific theologian any use at all for the Bible? Dr. Gиргенсон still acknowledges that there is a poetical, esthetical, and historical value in the Scriptures. Moreover, he believes that when the Bible has passed through the alembic of the modern scientific method, it will come forth purged from all dross. It will shine like pure gold, and men will behold its true worth, because they will recognize—what a thoroughly human product it is.

Thus modern advanced thought as applied to Bible-study has reached the climax of negation. It has seemed to us that

these reflections of a modernist deserve to be recorded, in order that it may be known what a Bible-quotation is worth in writings of scientific theologians.

Meanwhile the Word will pursue its course among men, and will accredit itself as divine to the hearts of men. The truth of that love which it proclaims is self-authenticating, and will beget in the will of men a love of the truth that will conquer every imagination of the proud reason of men. John 7, 17; Heb. 4, 12. 13.

D.

THE EUCHARISTIC INTERPRETATION OF JOHN 6.

(Concluded.)

2.

The discourse of our Lord on the Living Bread was addressed to a sensation-hungry, miracle-hunting multitude, who loved the Lord, not for what He spoke to their spirits, but for what He could do for their bodies. (John 6, 26.) Driven by some utopian fancy of a life of ease and plenty under His rulership, they had hurried to find the Lord after He had withdrawn from them, because they looked upon Him as the fulfiller of their worldly hopes. The Lord tells them that He is indeed the divinely accredited Dispenser of the Father's bounties to sinners. He will give them bread, however, bread that remains, and that feeds unto the life everlasting. That would be bread worthy of a man's toil, v. 27. They stand abashed for a moment, and then demand to know in what way they are to toil for this bread of which He is speaking; what is the God-appointed way to obtain this remarkable bread, v. 28. Jesus tells them that it is not by "works," but by a "work," *viz.*, by believing in Him whom the Father has sent, that they shall attain to the fruition of the Father's choicest gift to them, v. 29. In view of what follows, especially in vv. 37 and 44, it is not necessary to assume a paronomasia in the use of *ζητον* as a qualifier of *πιστις*, in order to secure our Lord against the charge that He has declared faith man's own work. The very

contrast between "works" and "work" is sufficient to repel that thought. Not anything that they have been doing, or that they may imagine themselves to be able to do, will put them in possession of the Bread of Heaven. It is only when a new activity has begun in them, when their heart shall confidently have embraced Christ as the Supplier of the great wants of their sin-famished souls,—of which they are not now thinking, and which, indeed, they cannot put forth of themselves,—that they shall have the Bread which will feed them here and hereafter.

Thus there is seen even in this introductory colloquy the tenor of the whole discourse of the Lord: the necessity of faith in Him to obtain eternal life. The whole discourse has for its theme that statement which our Lord made when parting from His disciples: "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned," or this other: "Neither is there salvation in any other!" which was also made at the time, and is made ever since, as an appeal to man's faith in Christ Jesus.

The Lord's questioners felt that, with His demand of faith in Himself, He was claiming a vast authority, an authority that must totally eclipse that of their most highly revered prophet Moses. They are now drawing a parallel between Christ and Moses for the very practical purpose of establishing the higher credibility and greater authority of the new Galilean prophet. They do not deny that He has wrought a miracle, but they deny that on the one miracle of feeding five thousand with a handful of provisions such a sweeping claim could be safely set up as Christ had advanced. No, He could not claim yet to have wrested to Himself the glory of Moses. He had not even equaled the marvelous feat of bringing down a supply of manna from heaven for forty years, and supporting a whole nation on this food, not to speak of having surpassed Moses. Hence, His demand that they must espouse Him to the exclusion even of Moses is overdrawn, unreasonable, and must be disallowed. They are willing to consider Him great, they are ready to admire Him; they are inclined to expect great things

of Him; but as yet they see no "irresistible reason for invincible faith" in Him. He must do greater works than He has done so far if He wants their full allegiance, vv. 30. 31.

Christ meets their challenge with a twofold denial of fact: 1. It was not Moses at all who gave them the bread of which they are speaking; 2. that bread which Moses gave them was not the true bread. Thus He reduces their claims very appreciably on two points: the power of Moses is limited to that of an agent who acts with authority and power transferred to him from a higher source; the efficacy of the manna is limited to the satisfying of physical wants. The whole phenomenon in the desert which the fathers had witnessed was primarily aimed at the removal of natural troubles, and if the fathers would meditate upon it as they should, it was to foreshadow to them secondarily the greater gift of God, which in the fulness of time would descend to them out of the bosom of the Father to put an end to all their spiritual troubles. Christ implies that back of Moses and the manna stands Himself, and what Moses and the faithful in Israel had in their pious meditations grasped as a harbinger of the future Messiah had now been bodied forth out of the bourne of eternity in the person of the Christ. The inference which He leaves to them to draw is: If the fathers had willingly credited and relied on the type, how much greater reason did the present generation have to espouse the antitype! vv. 32. 33.

Assuming now that the view of the Eucharist which sees in it nothing but an emblematic exhibition of the instruments by which the world's atonement was wrought were correct,—which it is not,—would not that view have to succumb at this point to the force of the "deadly parallel"? The difference between Old and New Testament conditions is set forth as that between the shadow and the substance. In the eucharistic conception of John 6 it becomes reduced to the substitution of a new emblem for an old. This by the way.

The Lord had permitted His hearers to peer through the veil of Old Testament history. Moreover, the solemn tone in

which He spoke of the episode of the manna in connection with His own mission had cowed the arrogant spirit of the men who were questioning His authority. When they address Him again, it is, not as before as "Rabbi," but as "Lord" that they appeal to Him. A glimpse of His divinity had been afforded them, but as yet it was a dim notion of His sovereign majesty that they held, and of His mission they still had a confused idea. Their carnal mind again misinterprets the word "bread" which He had used in speaking of Himself in a carnal manner. They now beg for a perennial supply of that wonderful bread of which He had spoken. They slip back into their Jewish thought of the utopian kingdom of the Messiah, v. 34. And now the Lord reaches the climax of His self-revelation to them: in plain, direct terms He tells them that the Bread on which His discourse has turned is not anything that is to come from Him, not any substance that He may convey to them, not any provision that He may make for them, but the Bread is He Himself. Likewise, possession of this Bread is secured, not by any act of purchase, barter, trade, not by any exertion on their part tending to any physical appropriation of a substance, but by "coming to Him." Now, they had come to Him,—had they not? They had, and they had not. They had conveyed their bodies into His presence; they were standing before Him, arguing with Him. But their hearts were still far from Him; no spiritual approach to this heavenly Food of Souls had been effected at all when they had come posthaste from Bethsaida to Capernaum. Unnumbered leagues of unbelief still stretched between their carnal intellect and flesh-bound will and His blessed word and expiatory work. They had come faithless, and hence they must go without the Bread which He was offering them, vv. 35. 36.

Thus the argument in this second exchange of questions and answers has advanced a distinct step in clarity and precision. The cardinal thought of this entire discourse has come out more boldly: Believing in the Son of Man as descended from heaven, accepting Him as God's gift for the soul-hunger

of this perishing world, placing Him with the strongest assurance above anything that God had hitherto conveyed to sinners for their salvation,—that is the *conditio sine qua non* for entering into life everlasting. It is the general Gospel message, the ordinary evangelical order of salvation by grace through faith in Christ Jesus, that is here set forth in elaborate form and striking imagery.

Commentators have noted the absence of any connection between v. 36 and what follows. They have pointed to “a significant asyndeton” at this place. It is possible that at this point the Jews began to shrink back from the Lord, and, forming little groups, began to argue in an undertone that the statement which they had just heard from Christ could not possibly rest on fact; and that the words of the Lord in vv. 37 to 40 were spoken to the disciples, and a few who remained close enough to listen to Him. There had been a note of pain discernible in the Lord’s last utterance to the Jews: they had Him visibly before Him, they could watch and study at ease His wonderful activity, and with all the facility for faith which they were privileged to have they had so far remained unbelievers, because they willed not to believe. But from the sadness of this scene the Lord’s thought now reverts to the Father. His seeming failures in His ministration to men do not dim His clear perception of the Father’s will, which coincides perfectly with His own. Faith—coming to Christ—is due to the “drawing of the Father.” He gives to Christ every believing soul that embraces the Redeemer as a reward of His work. What the Father gives Him He will gladly accept and foster and cherish as a dearly bought treasure; even through the abyss of death and the corruption of the sepulcher will the power of His redemptive work accompany the believer, and will restore at the last day that union between the believer’s body and soul which death had disrupted. And if any will not to believe, He will not idly pine over their deplorable choice, the only one which they could make upon their own decision. He is certain that, in proclaiming what He has just proclaimed

to these Jews, the Father's will is being executed, and therewith His own. The Savior is being presented to sinners, and the Father's drawing is there; the soul-conquering power of the Gospel is being manifested, which will make the unwilling willing, the unbeliever, skeptic, and doubter a joyful believer in the Lord.

Also these remarks of the Lord aid the main thought of this discourse. His mind is here dwelling on the effects of the ministry of the Gospel among men, upon that which is going on wherever men are brought within ear-shot of the ministry of reconciliation. There is here not even the faintest trace of an allusion to eucharistic occasions in the Church. Not the despisers of the Sacrament, but the contemners of the Word of Life are here arraigned.

But, we are reminded, the contention that the Lord's discourse on the Bread of Life bears a eucharistic character rests chiefly on that part which begins after v. 41. And in this part, it is claimed, the eucharistic interpretation of this entire discourse becomes unavoidable because of the introduction of a new element: the flesh of the Son of God, which is to be eaten, and His blood, which is to be drunk. These remarks of the Lord are made to reflect backward on what He had before said concerning the Bread of Life. While admitting that in the preceding part of the discourse the Lord had represented Himself, His entire person and work, as the Bread of Life, and believing in Him as the mode and means for appropriating Him, the defenders of the eucharistic conception of John 6 claim that those earlier remarks must be understood in the sense of the later. Let us see.

A thoroughly rationalistic argument was in progress among the groups of Jews which had formed after the Lord's last remark. This man, whose natural antecedents and social standing was known to them, had claimed heavenly origin and a divine commission. How dare He set up such a stupendous claim? It is utterly absurd. They had not directly expressed their scruples to the Lord, yet He "answers" their murmurings.

They hear Him presently addressing them and charging them, not with ignorance, but with unwillingness to submit to the teaching of God, which, as professing believers in the written revelation of God, they should have felt it a duty to do. Point for point the Lord reiterates His former statements and for their comprehension and acceptance remands the Jews back to a rule of their creed. God had never engaged to consider them believers for accepting what commended itself to their reason or pleasure, but He had engaged to make them believers in matters that transcended their intellect and seemed offensive to them. Other believers than such there had never been before in the Church of God. The rule of the ages will not be varied to suit the present generation. Believers ever will have to be God-taught, not man-made. God has sent the Teacher of His unfathomable mysteries of saving grace among them, and has clothed Him with power and majesty, to accredit His teachings to them by means of His works. The true school of faith is thrown open to them; they have heard the primary lesson of faith from the Teacher's lips, and He will repeat it to them in still plainer terms: "I am the living Bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread which I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world," vv. 41—50.

It was pointed out before that the Jews regarded the Bread of Life as something distinct from Christ Himself, for which He would merely act as the purveyor, and that Christ over against this notion stated again and again, and with increasing emphasis, that He was Himself that Bread, that the Jews would not get it from Him or through Him, but in and with Him. For to obtain the Bread they must come to Him and believe in Him. Moreover, while asserting His divine commission as the One whom the Father had "sealed," v. 27, and who "is of God, and hath seen the Father," v. 46, and while indicating His Messianic character as the Antitype of ancient type and the Fulfiller of prophecy, the Lord had not neglected to call attention to His humanity. He, as "the Son of Man,"

would give them the Bread of Life. The promised Messiah is theanthropic. His human nature was assumed for the ends of His Messiahship. He must live the life of a true man, being found in fashion as a man, that He may render that perfect obedience to the divine Law which man had omitted, and He must die the death of a true man, that He may cancel the guilt of many trespasses of the Law which man had committed. All this required that He have "flesh," a human body and soul, living a human life from the manger to the cross. The Messianic portrait would be incomplete without the Messiah's "flesh"; in fact, the Messiah as God alone would not be the Messiah whom the world had been taught to expect. And the surrender of His "flesh" in His sacrificial death constitutes His flesh the Bread of Life. Or, in other words, the Son of God incarnate made a sin-offering of Himself by bearing the world's sin in His own body on the tree, and the Christ who did this—and because He did this—is the Bread of Life; for it is His atonement which the soul of a believer appropriates as its life, according to the statement of Paul: "The life which I now live I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me," Gal. 2, 20.

The additional remark, then, concerning His flesh, which the Lord makes in this section, does not carry His argument into a new territory, but merely expands and specializes what He has before said concerning Himself. Only by a rash and superficial exegesis can the term "flesh" in John 6 be taken as a reference to the Eucharist.

This holds good also with regard to the next section, vv. 52—59. It is true that the new phraseology which the Lord had adopted intensified the captiousness and opposition of the Jews: their "murmuring" now became a "striving." Taking the Lord's words about the eating of His flesh in a literal meaning, they reached a conclusion which amounted to cannibalism. Nowhere in this entire discourse had the Lord referred to the human mouth as the organ of eating, as little as He had indicated that the "coming to Him" was to be

a locomotive action to be performed by the feet. He had, by varying His terms, clearly shown that the coming, eating, etc., of which He spoke are acts of faith and synonymous with believing. Hence, the flesh of which He spoke could not mean the material body, and any other physical substance upon which a true act of eating could be performed He had not indicated. The eating in this discourse is not an eating of the sacramental element in the Lord's Supper.

The Lord interrupts the excited disputations of His listeners by reiterating all His former statements, and adding to the remark about His flesh a similar remark about His blood, thereby completing the description of His expiatory death. Just as little as the mention of the term "flesh" in the preceding section stamps this discourse eucharistic, so little does the mention of "blood" in this section. "Blood" here, as "flesh" before, is used metonymically; the cause is named for the effect, the redeming instruments for the redemption. And as there is no physical substance indicated here which men are to drink, so there is here no reference to any physical act of drinking.

The discourse of the Lord in the synagog at Capernaum had a sequel in the circle of His immediate followers. They, too, murmured about "the hard saying" which they had heard, and were reproved. In this connection the Lord once more uttered words (v. 63) which have been strangely wrested from their context to support the eucharistic interpretation of John 6. "The flesh profiteth nothing," — these words have been understood of the flesh of Christ, in flagrant contradiction to what the Lord throughout this discourse has said concerning the life-bestowing power of His flesh. Luther in his treatise on the Sacrament has spoken the last word on this mistaken interpretation.¹⁾ What the Lord warns His disciples against is a rationalistic interpretation of His teaching. His remark in

1) See St. L. Ed. XX, 762 ff.: "Dass diese Worte Christi: 'Das ist mein Leib,' etc., noch fest stehen," especially col. 823 ff. Also his treatise against Carlstadt: "Wider die himmlischen Propheten," XX, 263 ff.

v. 63 puts the last rivet into the claim that this whole discourse must be interpreted of the spiritual appropriation of His merits by faith, which appropriation is absolutely necessary for everybody who is saved, and occurs independently of the Eucharist wherever His Gospel is proclaimed and believed.

The entire claim, moreover, that John 6 bears a eucharistic character rests on a prolepsis. The Sacrament was not instituted until some time after this discourse at Capernaum had been spoken. But to assume a prolepsis in this discourse is impossible, because the Lord speaks of immediate needs of His hearers, and of a present means for supplying those needs. In so far as the spiritual eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ, *i. e.*, the believing acceptation of His vicarious work, occurs also at the Sacrament, this text may now, after the Sacrament has been instituted, be employed to show wherein a salutary use of the Sacrament consists, but it does not refer to the substance of the Sacrament, which did not then exist, and cannot be used to define that peculiar sacramental eating and drinking which Paul describes in 1 Cor. 11.

To sum up, the eucharistic interpretation of John 6 is indefensible on the following grounds:—

1) It is true that Christ speaks, metaphorically, of the eating of His flesh (not body), and of the drinking of His blood. But it was not until a year later that He solemnly ordained that rite of which He said: "Do this in remembrance of Me." We have no record that after His discourse at Capernaum the Lord's Supper began to be celebrated by His disciples. And the record of the institution of the Lord's Supper states plainly that the Sacrament was instituted "in the night in which He was betrayed." Whatever, then, Christ meant in His discourse at Capernaum, He did not mean the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Those who appeal to John 6 as a *sedes doctrinae* of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper must grant, in order to hold their own ground, that the Lord's Supper was in existence before it had been instituted.

2) Where the three evangelists and St. Paul present the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, they speak of an eating and drinking of the body and blood of the Lord which may bring damnation, *viz.*, to an unworthy communicant, 1 Cor. 11, 29. Such a possibility is not even remotely considered in John 6. On the contrary, we are told in vv. 54, 56 that the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood of which the Lord speaks in this place is always salutary; it is always to the end of obtaining eternal life. Those who appeal to John 6 as a *sedes doctrinae* for the Lord's Supper must grant, in order to hold their own ground, that no person can commune unworthily.

3) In John 6 the Lord speaks of an eating and drinking that is absolutely necessary for salvation: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," v. 53. But of the eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper Paul says 1 Cor. 11, 28: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat," etc. Hence, persons who are not capable of self-examination are not admitted to the Lord's Supper. Those who appeal to John 6 as a *sedes doctrinae* for the Lord's Supper are forced to believe, if they will be true to their own arguments, that all believers who have not communed will be damned.

4) In John 6 our Lord speaks of His flesh and blood, but names no external elements by means of which these are to be taken, while those elements are named and exhibited in the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper. Those who appeal to John 6 as a *sedes doctrinae* for the doctrine of the Sacrament must do one of two things: either they must eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood without any external means like the anthropophagi, or they must admit that the words "eating" and "drinking," likewise the words "flesh" and "blood," in John 6, cannot be taken literally, but must be understood figuratively, *viz.*, for believing in the atoning sacrifice of Christ and those feasting on His merits with the mouth of faith.

D.

THE CORPUS CHRISTI FESTIVAL AND ITS DOCTRINE.

(Concluded.)

THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION IN ITS RELATION TO THE CORPUS CHRISTI FESTIVAL.

The doctrine whose origin we have thus briefly sketched was the center, the very core, of the Roman Catholic dogma. It was a stronghold which had to be held at all costs, now that it had been established and its importance recognized. It cannot be surprising, then, that the idea of a festival for the glorification of this central dogma of Romanism and its attendant features was hailed with delight by the leaders of the Church. The doctrine itself was emphasized on the proposed festival, it was the “festum corporis Domini”; the host was magnified, the consecrated bread being exhibited before the assembled multitude; the power of the priests was demonstrated; and, finally, the adoration of the host was insisted upon and practised.

The theologians that passed on the feast may have gotten the original idea of the institution of such a festival from Liége, Robert de Torote probably being the father of the thought. The leaders of the Church gladly accepted the story of the vision of Juliana for the sake of the credulous laity; but there can be no doubt that the real and only reason for the institution of the festival of Corpus Christi was ecclesiastical polity, as outlined above.

This impression is strengthened when we consider, in addition to the foregoing, the question of indulgences in connection with the festival. Urban IV, in the bull *Transiturus*, establishing the festival, says concerning indulgences: “*Nos enim Christi fideles ad colendum tantum festum et celebrandum donis volentes spiritualibus animare, omnibus vere poenitentibus et confessis, qui matutinali officio festi eiusdem in ecclesia, in qua idem celebrabitur, interfuerint, centum; qui vero Missae, totidem; qui autem in primis ipsius festi vesperis interfuerint, similiter centum; qui vero in secundis, totidem; illis vero, qui*

primae, tertiae, sextae, nonae ac completorii officiis interfuerint, pro qualibet horarum ipsarum, quadraginta; illis autem, qui per octavas illius festi matutinalibus, vespertinis, Missae ac praedictarum horarum officiis interfuerint, centum dies, singulis octavarum suarum diebus, in omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac beatorum apostolorum eius Petri et Pauli autoritate confisi, de injunctis sibi poenitentiis relaxamus." The sum of indulgences for the Corpus Christi day alone would, according to this, amount to 460 days. If, in addition to that, one attended matins, vespers, and mass, together with the canonical hours on any other day of the Corpus Christi octave, a hundred days for each day was granted. This fact explains the entry of "a thousand days' pardon" in some books and proclamations, this being, in a round sum, the total of the indulgences granted. The object of the special, unusually high pardon was to make the festival as attractive as possible to the great mass, to get the laity interested, and also to impress them with the greatness of the power of the pope and the priests. This last idea is emphasized very strongly to this day. This may also be sufficient to explain the Chester record of 1544, in which we are told that "Henry Fraunces . . . obtayned and gate of Clement, then beyng (bushop of Rome, a thousand) daies of pardon, and of the Bushop of Chester, at that time beyng xlii daies of pardon graunted from thensforth to every person, &c." (Chambers, Vol. II, 344.). If nothing else, it at least shows us what stress was laid on everything connected with the festival. How important this is from the standpoint of the clergy will be shown later.

This same reason of ecclesiastical polity, of a definite plan and object from the view-point of the Church, stands out very prominently also when we examine the Corpus Christi office as composed by Thomas of Aquinas. The idea of transubstantiation is defined: "The Word Incarnate, by a word, From bread His own flesh divine, And from pure wine His blood prepared." "After the paschal lamb, when the feast's course was run, Gave He His body entire to each single one."

In the Sacrament the substance of bread and wine is changed into the body and blood of Christ."

"That true bread to flesh is turned
Is in Christian dogma learned,
And to blood the holy wine."

There is also a full copy of that part of the bull *Transiturus* treating of indulgences. The entire office of Corpus Christi seems to point to the reason for, and the object of, the festival as outlined above. Werner, in his *Der heilige Thomas von Aquinas*, makes the statement that the institution of the Corpus Christi festival was one of the chief purposes of Aquinas's life, and that he urged Urban IV to establish it. This, again, points to the same conclusion: that it was not veneration for a poor *religieuse* and her visions which prompted Urban IV to issue the order for the establishment of the Corpus Christi festival, but rather that this central festival of the Roman Church was the result of the consistent development of the dogma of transubstantiation and its attendant features. The argument, no doubt, was this: Since the institution of a festival as outlined will present the sum total of the plan of salvation with its central idea of a vicarious sacrifice, since it will enhance the glory of the Church and the power of the priests, we ought to have it, and with all the splendor and impressiveness we can summon to our aid.

The impressiveness of the festival was made necessary by its theological significance. And no one was better equipped to bring out the one by keeping the other constantly in mind than Thomas of Aquinas. His *Office for the Feast of Corpus Christi* is a liturgical masterpiece. And to understand fully the relation of doctrine and festival in this instance, we must have a good idea of the scope of the Corpus Christi office and its symbolism. That the concept of transubstantiation was sufficiently emphasized in the office, we have seen above. But the office embraces a good deal more. This is hinted at when the reason for the establishment is given: "In order that the faithful, by the entire office of the feast, might recall the

institution of so great a sacrament." Accordingly, the sacrificial character of the death of Christ is emphasized: "His body He offered as a sacrifice for our reconciliation on the altar of the cross to God the Father"; "To Thee, O Lord of earth and heaven, Be glory everlasting, Who life for us hast likewise given." The fact that the vicarious sacrifice of Christ is given such prominence is significant, because the office thereby reaches backward to Adam and forward to eternal bliss. The salient points in the entire plan of redemption are touched upon. We have allusions to the Paschal Lamb, Christ the Paschal Lamb, the Sacrifice of a Kid on the Evening of the Paschal Festival, the Slaying of Isaac, the Offering Isaac Bore, King Melchizedek, King David, Treading the Press, the Holy Prophets, Bread from Heaven, Manna's Store, Bread Which the Lord Hath Given, the Going Out of Egypt, Elijah's Meal of the Hearth-Cakes, the Manger Birth, the Visit at Simon the Leper's, the Sacrifice on the Cross, the Lord's Supper. The fall of Adam is presupposed and implied in the entire office. That these allusions and quotations in the liturgy were by no means accidental or for the purpose of mere liturgical embellishment, is evident from the words of the office: "He [Christ] instituted this Sacrament as a perpetual memorial of His passion, the *fulfilment of olden types*, the greatest of the miracles He performed; and He left to those He saddened by His absence a singular consolation." In one of the hymns of the office we are told that the mystery of the Eucharist was

"In diverse types foreshown of yore,
In the offering Isaac bore,
In Paschal Lamb and manna's store,
To our sires contributed."

And besides giving a summary of the plan of redemption, the final end and object of salvation is plainly stated: "Since men desire meat and drink that they may neither hunger nor thirst, this, verily, none can bring about save only that meat and drink that maketh them who partake of it immortal and

incorruptible, namely, that fellowship of the saints where dwelleth peace and the fulness of perfect unity." "To Thee, O Lord of earth and heaven, Be glory everlasting, who life for us hast likewise given, In our own Father's home to see." We may add, also, that the entire tendency of the office is toward this object, and the climax is wonderfully effective. O'Neill says of this work of St. Thomas: "The glory of the Sacrament was the object of his work." Werner is even more emphatic in his praise. He writes of the Corpus Christi office: "Man hat dies Werk mit Recht eine grossartige liturgische Epopoe genannt; in der Konzeption desselben offenbart sich die Meisterschaft eines erhabenen Geistes; in Wahl und Zusammenstellung seiner Bestandstuecke wurde die Idee des Festes erst zum vollstaendigen Ausdruck gebracht. Er feiert den Frieden und die Glorie des neuen Jerusalem, die aus geheimnisvollen Tiefen entstroemenden Quellen seiner fortgesetzten himmlischen Erneuerung, die gnadenreiche Herrlichkeit der Kirche des Neuen Bundes unter bildlicher Veranschaulichung durch die prophetischen Typen der Kirche des Alten Bundes und begeisterter Antizipation der zukuenftigen Glorie der im Genusse Gottes seligen Gemeinde der Heiligen." (p. 792.) Summing up these rather extravagant remarks, we have this plain fact that the office of Corpus Christi was to demonstrate and symbolize the glory of the Church, as based upon the plan of redemption shown in the Old and New Testaments, and, finally, the glory of the Church Triumphant. And another fact must not be overlooked. The concept of transubstantiation took the Savior out of the abstract and made Him concrete, especially to the unlearned mass; it took the purely spiritual aspect away, and made Him a physical being. This, of course, enhanced the effect of the festival a hundredfold. The "blood-miracles," in which, owing to the presence of bacteria, the wafer shows blood-red spots, and the "miracle of Bolsena," in which a few drops from a consecrated chalice, falling on the linen corporal, assumed the color of blood and the outline of the consecrated host (see *Schaff*

Herzog Encyclopedia, s. v. "Miracle of Bolsena"), intensified this feeling. To the people everything that they saw before them became very real. And the pope (Urban IV), seeing in this unquestioning acceptance of the alleged miracles by the people the strongest bulwark of the Church against enemies and heresies, very prudently sought and obtained the approval and the unswerving allegiance of the laity. Other purposes of the Church, other objects of the Curia, may be carried out by the clergy or by clerical orders alone, but not the idea of the Corpus Christi festival. And the people, whose interest was sought, responded most nobly, especially when the Corpus Christi exercises were extended to include the procession, as we shall see presently.

THE GENERAL INTRODUCTION OF THE FESTIVAL AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PROCESSION.

We have, till now, given the history of the establishment of the Corpus Christi festival, endeavoring to present especially the real reason for its institution, as well as its purpose. The festival, as we have seen, had its inception at Liége, in Belgium. It may be that Pope Urban IV caused it to be celebrated in Rome, and as far as his personal influence extended. It was not till 1311, however, that the festival was officially accepted by the Church. And even then, on account of the difficulties in regard to the *Clementine Constitutions*, there may yet have been some hesitation. All this seems to have been changed by the action of John XXII, in 1316, when he removed all doubts in regard to the validity of the *Decretals*. The order to celebrate the festival was, from that time on, a part of the Canon Law, and while news and also papal orders of that day did not travel with the speed of electricity, yet the festival was rapidly introduced. We have several records of the second decade of the fourteenth century in France, and Alt, in his *Der christliche Kultus*, says that the festival was early accepted in Spain. Of Italy we may be quite sure, and there is also evidence from Germany to show the early celebration of the

new festival: Cologne, 1306; Worms, 1315; Strassburg, 1316. (See *Cath. Encycl.*) In regard to Great Britain, Spencer, in his *Corpus Christi Pageants in England*, says: "Of the growth and spread of the Corpus Christi feast on the Continent and in England we have very little authentic information. It is not even known when the procession was first introduced into England. Thomas Sprott, in his *Chronicles*, records that the festival was a confirmed institution by the year 1318." This remark is based on Davies, in his *York Records*. As a matter of fact, we have some pretty good and reliable information in regard to the introduction of the Corpus Christi feast in England. In the reports of the Historical MSS Commission (8th report, Vol. VII, under "Dean and Chapter of Canterbury," p. 321) there is the following entry: "Early in the fourteenth century the priors drew up fresh regulations for services in the church on festival days, and, the chapter having agreed that the new feast of Corpus Christi and the Oblation and Conception of the Virgin should be adopted at Canterbury, measures were taken for their orderly celebration." (*Ordinacio Capituli de festivitate Corporis Christi*.) By this article, dated 1317, Corpus Christi day was declared to be a principal feast. It was at the same time agreed that any monk absent from the special services appointed for the festival, should on the next day have "but half his commons in the refectory, and be forbidden to eat or drink elsewhere." This is surely one of the earliest records of the celebration of the feast anywhere. But there is another significant entry in *The Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages* (Vol. I, *Historia Monasterii Sancti Petri Gloucesteriae*, p. 44): "Nota de festivitate Corporis Christi (1318). Anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo decimo octavo incepit festivitas de Corpore Christi generali celebrari per totam ecclesiam Anglicanam." These entries are so plain that comment is unnecessary. The festival of Corpus Christi had been discussed even before 1318, and was celebrated in 1317 at least at Canterbury, which makes it likely that it was held also at other

places, and from 1318 on it was generally celebrated throughout England.

Turning now to the question of the *Corpus Christi procession*, the difficulty of a dearth of records again presents itself. In spite of this fact, however, we are enabled to form a good idea of this very important feature of the day from the extant records. Religious processions were nothing unusual in the Church at that time. They had been in use on special occasions since the fourth century. Processions in times of drought, for the purpose of blessing the fields, as well as the mere marching through the streets, were a matter of custom. But the Corpus Christi festival, as originally planned, had no procession, neither as an integral nor as an attendant feature. Urban IV had made no provision for such an addition, nor does he even mention the idea in his bull of institution. In 1286, Durandus of Mende (1237-1296), bishop of Mende, Southern France, 1286-1296, published his *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*. In this book he mentions all the processions which were then in use. That of Corpus Christi is not mentioned. When John XXII, in 1316, re-issued the Canon Law, containing also the papal decree for the celebration of the Corpus Christi day, he very cleverly added an order for an attendant procession, whether as an amendment to the original bull or in separate form is not quite evident. All authorities agree that the procession was ordered by this pope (1316-1334), and Binterim fixes the date as 1316 (*Denkwuerdigkeiten*, p. 289, and note). Now it may seem strange that the order for the institution of the festival, although announced at the Council of Vienna, was so long delayed in its execution. But the reason for this is, most probably, the following. Clement V had the decisions of the Council of Vienna and his own decretals collected (according to the traditional system) into five books, which he promulgated in 1313, apparently under the title of *Liber Septimus* (of the decretal collections), and sent to the University of Orleans. Then, however, he stopped its further

circulation and had it revised, so that it was sent to Paris and Bologna only by his successor, John XXII, in 1317. This collection afterward became known as the Clementine Constitutions. (See above.)

The procession seems to have been introduced at the same time, and, perhaps, to the same extent as the festival itself. A council held at Sens, in 1320, and one held at Paris, in 1323, both speak of the procession. After granting indulgences to those who observe abstinence and fasting on the vigil of Corpus Christi, they add these words: "As to the solemn procession made on the Thursday's feast, when the Holy Sacrament is carried, seeing that it appears to have been introduced in these our times by a sort of inspiration, we prescribe nothing at present, and leave all concerning it to the devotion of the clergy and the people." (Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year*, Vol. VII, P. 1, p. 287 ff.) It seems that the order of John XXII had merely named the procession as a part of the celebration, leaving the extent and the manner in which the procession should be held to the individual dioceses or parishes. It was implied, no doubt, that the procession be held at least in the churches as a part of the liturgical service. But whether the procession should also leave the church and march through the principal streets, and whether the clergy alone should participate, or whether the laymen should also be asked to join, that was placed entirely into the discretion of each diocese or parish. This latitude ought to be kept in mind, for it is a very important factor in the latter development of the festival. The procession is mentioned in an act of the Chapter of Tournai, in 1325, and in a manuscript of the Church of Chartres, in 1330. That the custom of carrying the sacramentarium through the streets was not a general one in the fourteenth century is seen from the *Chronicle* of Donatus Bossius of Milan, who tells us that on Thursday, the 24th of May, 1404, "there was carried, for the first time, solemnly, the body of Christ in the streets of Padua, which has since become the custom." In this city they had always held the

procession inside the churches (the dome of Padua being exceptionally spacious, there was sufficient room), but they followed the lead of other cities, and had the theophoric procession in the open. By the time of Popes Martin V (1429) and Eugenius IV (1433) the procession was in such general use that they, in their *Constitutions*, grant indulgences to those that are present at the carrying of the host.

If we now turn to England, we find evidences that the procession was held there very early in connection with the festival. The earliest record is that of *Ipswich*. "In 1325 the former Gild Merchant was reconstituted as a Gild of Corpus Christi. The constitution provides for a procession on Corpus Christi day, unless it is hindered 'pro qualitate temporis.'" (J. Wodderspoon, *Memorials of the Ancient Town of Ipswich*, p. 161.) The constitution is given complete in the Reports of the Historical MSS Commission (Vol. VIII, 9th report, 244 ff.). The Corpus Christi Gild at *London*, according to Spencer, who probably bases his notes on Davidson (*Corpus Christi Pageants*, p. 11), dates back to 1327. At *Lincoln*, the Gild of Tailors was founded in 1328, and we read in their ordinances: "All the bretheren and sisteren shall go in procession on the feast of Corpus Christi." (Smith, *English Gilds*, 182.) Next in order comes *Beverley*, of which we are told: "The Gild of Corpus Christi, consisting primarily of priests, was founded at Beverley between 1330 and 1350 to regulate the procession." Its ordinances have been printed (Proceedings of the Soc. of Antiquaries, XV, 116), Selden Society, *Beverley Town Documents*, p. lix. In the ordinances of the Gild of Tylers, *Lincoln*, founded 1346, occurs the passage: "A feast shall be held on the festival of Corpus Christi." (Smith, *English Gilds*, p. 184), and it is very probable that the feast was held after the procession. The Corpus Christi Gild of *Hull* was founded on the 31st of May, 1358 (*Engl. Gilds*, 160). The Corpus Christi Gild at *Coventry* antedates the last mentioned by at least ten years. There is a confirmation of a license of mortmain granted to the gild under

date of the 26th of May, 1348, in which occurs the following passage: "On the feast of Corpus Christi all the bretheren and sisteren shall be clad in livery at their own cost, and shall carry viij torches around the body of Christ when it is borne through the town of Coventry." (L. c., 232.) There is at least one more interesting record from the fourteenth century: "The first entry [relating to the Corpus Christi festival] which occurs in the York records is of the reign of Richard II. On the 8th of May, 1388, William de Selby, then mayor, delivered to Stephen de Yolton 100 shillings, which Master Thomas de Buxton had given for furnishing four torches to be burned in the procession of the feast of Corpus Christi." (Davies, *York Records*, 230.) In 1408, the Corpus Christi Gild at York was founded. This was a very powerful gild, having, at one time, a membership of 14,850, including a great many nobles and influential people. (*Engl. Gilds*, p. 142, note.) These records show that the procession was adopted in England almost with the introduction of the festival, for in every case but that of Ipswich provision was made for a feature which was already acknowledged and in use, but needed better regulation and supervision. They also show the great interest which the people of England displayed from the very inception of the idea. This, again, is very significant for our argument as to the purpose of the festival.

Owing to the reasons given above, there was a great variety as to the *order* of the procession and the various degrees of splendor with which it was put forth in the several cities. Moreover, local conditions often made it necessary to make changes in the established order or mode. Ipswich offers the most complete records for the order of the procession in the earliest times. We are referred (*Hist. MSS Commission*, Vol. VIII, 9th report, p. 245) to a Liber Quartus of Richard Pereyvale, "wherein is contained the constitucion for Corpus Christi Procession.—Anno MoCCCvicesimo quinto. The members of the Guild, the priores ecclesie Sanctae Trinitatis et ecclesie Sancti Petri in Gippewico, et omnes sacerdotes paro-

chiales ville praedictae ordinavimus firmiter per praesentes perpetuis temporibus,—In primis ordinamus quod singulis annis quinta feria post octavas Pentecostes quando sacrosancta ecclesia circa hoc saeraumentum venerandum specialiter occupatur . . . unumquemque sacerdotem parochialem praecedentem eruce cum vexillis quotquot fuerint ad processionem solempnem in praedicta villa faciendam ad devocationem maiorem fidelium excitandam et haereticorum pravitatem detestandam et sic cum tabernaculo nostro huic processioni specialiter deputato, in quo sacramentum Christi Corporis et Sanguinis continebitur et per ecclesiam S. Petri cum viris religiosis processuri &c.” With the host carried before them, and the clergy at the head of the procession, the members of the gild marched through the streets, one year from St. Trinity to St. Peter, the next year from St. Peter to St. Trinity. It is interesting to note the similarity of many passages in this constitution to corresponding passages in the bull *Transiturus* in the *Decretals*.

The records from Beverley are dated a century later. An entry of the year 1416, concerning the Barkers, provides: “Duas torchias deferendas coram Corpore Christi.” Leach translates this: “Two torches to be borne in procession in the feast of Corporis Christi.” The context does not make it quite clear whether these torches were to be carried by special bearers before the host, or whether the Barkers simply bore the expense of two torches which were carried at the head of their craft in the procession. The complete order of the procession is given in an entry 1430—1431. First came the clergy of the Corpus Christi Gild, then the gilds of various saints, then the craft-gilds, and, finally, several minor religious gilds. But they all were to march “*behind* the most holy Body of Christ.” The host, then, was carried at the *head* of the procession, according to the general order of processions. In 1498, the “Order of Procession on Corpus Christi Day” was much the same, the host evidently again being borne at the head of the procession, and followed by the twelve governors, the merchants, drapers, and the other craft-gilds. Of York, Davies gives this

account: "On the morrow of the Corpus Christi day the persons who were to join in the procession assembled at the great gates of the priory of the Holy Trinity in Micklegate. The parochial clergy of the city, in their surplices, walked first. The Master of the Gild, invested with a silken cope, appeared as 'praesidens principalis.' He was supported on either side by two of the clergy, who had previously filled the same office, and was attended by the six keepers of the gild, with silk stoles about their necks and white wands in their hands. The costly shrine was borne in the midst by the chaplain of the gild. After the ecclesiastics came the Lord Mayor, aldermen, and other members of the corporation in their robes of ceremony, attended by the city officers, . . . and followed by the officers and members of the numerous crafts or trade companies of the city with their banners and torches, taking their places according to a prescribed order of precedence. . . . From the priory gates they marched to the cathedral, where a sermon was preached in the chapter house." That this account of Davies is, at least in the main, correct appears from several entries. "Fifteenth year of Edward IV (1461—1483). Expenses at the feast of Corpus Christi include the reward of the Friar Preacher on the Friday next following, according to custom." (Davies, p. 43.) Three years later we have the entry: "Expenses at the feast of Corpus Christi . . . and 3 s. 4 d. paid to one preaching and delivering a sermon on the morrow of the said feast in the cathedral church of St. Peter of York, after the celebration of the procession, according to the like custom." (p. 77.) From a compotus of the reign of Henry VIII (1509—1547): "In processione generali in crastino Corporis Christi. . . . Clerico portanti crucem ante processionem ijd." (p. 246.) This agrees with the original ordinances of the York Corpus Christi Gild. (Smith, *English Gilds*, p. 141 f.) "They are bound to keep a solempne procession, the sacrament being in a shryne borne in the same through the city of York, yerely, the Fryday after Corpus Christi day; and the

day after, to have a solempne mass and dirige, to pray for the prosperity of brothers and sisters lyving and the souls departed."

Of the greatest importance in this festival was the *participation of the laity*, and especially the craft-gilds. The interest of the laity was eagerly sought and assiduously fostered by the granting of indulgences and by a special degree of pomp and splendor in the festival. And the craft-gilds, which were at this time just about beginning to develop, responded nobly. It is very likely that the clergy alone took part in the original Corpus Christi procession, at the introduction of the festival in England. After the organizing of special Corpus Christi gilds, to which not only the parochial clergy, but, at least in later years, also laymen belonged, these gilds took charge of the procession. The way having thus been opened to the laity, the other craft-gilds either made application to be permitted to join in the procession, or were requested to do so by the Corpus Christi guild, for the purpose of enhancing the impression and the pomp of the procession. We are expressly told that the Gild of Tailors of Lincoln, founded 1328, went in the Corpus Christi procession. And if this newly organized gild could immediately participate in the procession, surely the older gilds would not stand back. And any new gild that might be organized would surely clamor for a like privilege. Some gilds were old even at the time of the introduction of the festival. The Merchant Gild of Beverley dates back to 1130, its earliest ordinances to 1210. The Weavers pointed back to 1209, the Bakers, Brewsters, and Butchers to 1279, with new ordinances in 1366. Moreover, when the monopoly of the Merchants was broken in 1335, other tradesmen had the opportunity of forming gilds. At Lincoln, the Fullers dated back to 1279. At Norwich the gilds were somewhat late in organizing, but even there the Tailors were organized in 1350, the Carpenters in 1375, the Peltiers in 1376, and the Saddlers and Spurriers in 1385.

Each gild, according to its age, its membership, and its wealth, wanted to be represented in the religious life of the community, which found its vent in all manner of processions and its culmination in the Corpus Christi celebration. In the middle of the fourteenth century, when the number of gilds was still small, the procession was indeed the most noteworthy of the year, but still comparatively insignificant in comparison with later days. It was with the rapidly growing number of wealthy gilds that the procession became the very brilliant affair which is described in the accounts of that period.

This gradual expansion of the procession and the accompanying splendor exerted an influence in various ways. One of the most significant changes was in regard to the *time of the procession*. Originally, the procession was held on the morning of Corpus Christi day in connection with the regular celebration of the festival. At Coventry the order was: procession, mass, plays, feast. At Ipswich the procession occurred early in the morning, as we have seen, followed by services. At Bristol the order for St. Katherine's festival was: plays on the eve of St. Katherine, procession in the morning of the festival day, mass after return from the procession. At Newcastle on Tyne the procession was held "by viij in morning," while the plays were in the afternoon. (Chambers, Vol. II, 385.) At Beverley the plays originally followed the procession, according to Leach (*Beverley Town Documents*, p. LIX); but there is an entry under date 1498: "Procession of Corpus Christi or of the morn after." At York, at one time, the plays were held on the vigil of Corpus Christi day (Wednesday), and the procession on the morning of the festival. This was after the sermon of Friar William Melton, in 1426. Later on, in the same century, however, we are told that the procession was held on the Friday after Corpus Christi, followed by services with a sermon in church, while the plays were presented on the festival day. Evidently the spirits which the clergy had summoned refused to remain subordinate.

Now as to the *purpose* of the solemn public theophoric procession we hardly need further testimony. The words of the bull of institution about emphasizing the central dogma of the Roman Church, and about "confounding the perfidy and insanity [lack of good sense] of the heretics," apply here also. This is evident from the constitution of the Ipswich Corpus Christi Gild, in which the object of the procession is stated: "Ad devocationem majorem fidelium excitandam et hereticorum pravitatem detestandam et sic cum tabernaculo nostro . . . processuri. . . ." That the displaying of the host and its worship with a special degree of splendor, including the idea of proselyting, was the purpose of the procession, is especially apparent also from the resolutions of the Council of Trent (1546—1563, sessio 13, c. 5, *De Eucharistia*): "The holy council declares that there has been most piously and religiously introduced into God's Church the practise that each year, on a certain special feast, the august and venerable Sacrament should be honored with singular veneration and solemnity, and that it should be reverently and with every honor carried in procession through the public roads and places. For it is most just that certain holidays should be appointed, whereon all Christians should, with special and unusual demonstrations, evince their gratitude and mindfulness toward their common Lord and Redeemer for this so unspeakable and truly divine favor, in which is represented His victory and triumph over death. And it was also necessary that thus invincible truth should triumph over lying and heresy, that her enemies, seeing all that splendor, and being in the midst of such great joy of the whole Church, should either grow wearied and acknowledge their being beaten and broken, or, being ashamed and confounded, should be converted." These words are so plain that further comment is unnecessary.

We are now in a position to *draw our conclusions* and make our applications from the material presented above. This summary would embrace the following:

1) The festival of Corpus Christi was established as the result of a gradual development of the doctrine of transubstantiation and its attendant features, and culminating in the concept of a visible sacrifice, the adoration of the host, and the supreme power of the priests.

2) Its establishment being urged by the leaders of the Church, including principally Thomas of Aquin and Bonaventura, its chief purpose was the glorification of the Roman Church in its central dogma.

3) The procession which was established at the time of the general promulgation of the festival was originally held on Corpus Christi day, perhaps, in some cases, preceded by an early mass, and followed by services. In some cases the day of the procession was later changed to Wednesday or Friday, on account of the plays.

4) The order of the procession originally was: clergy with host, followed by the other participants, especially the craft-gilds.

5) The procession was held with different degrees of splendor, according to the wealth and importance of a diocese, city, or parish.

6) The craft-gilds, which joined the procession one after another, gradually came to exert a great influence in regard to everything connected with it. Since they were in the great majority and often very powerful in the community, their desire often became the law.

7) The purpose of the procession was: the public display of the host and its worship, the glorification of the Church, the impressing of the heretics with the power and splendor of the Church, and, finally, proselytizing.

St. Paul, Minn.

PAUL E. KRETMANN.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE THIRD ARTICLE.

OF THE CHURCH.

Marks of the Church. (Concluded.)

1 John 4, 1: *Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.*

The “spirits” mentioned in our text are men of flesh and bone, *prophets*, as the context discloses. Some “spirits” “are of God,” and hence are to be believed; others, and there are *many* of them, “are not of God,” v. 3, and are to be shunned. “*Beloved*,”—love for your immortal souls impels me to warn you,—“*believe not every spirit.*” These spirits, prophets, manifest their wisdom by preaching, and demand *belief*, acceptance. But be on your guard. The very doctrine they preach manifests their spirit. “*Try the spirits*”; there is great danger: “*many false prophets are gone out into the world.*” Try them, “*whether they are of God*,” or whether they breathe the spirit of Antichrist, v. 3. How are you to know whether they are “*of God*”? This is the test: “*Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God,*” v. 2. If these spirits publish a wisdom contrary to “*the wisdom of God*,” 1 Cor. 2, they are not of God, not actuated by His Spirit. They are false prophets. Beloved, believe them not!

In 1529, at Marburg, Luther was face to face with such a false prophet—Zwingli. Despite the grave differences between his doctrine of the Lord’s Supper and that of the Bible, which Luther upheld, Zwingli offered Luther the right hand of fellowship. Luther refused, saying: “*God’s Word and His truth are dearer to me than the friendship of the whole world. You have a different spirit from ours.*”

Indirectly there is a *consolation* contained in the present

passage. If the apostle in his days saw the necessity of warning the Christians against "*many* false prophets," need we marvel that we must combat with so many to day? Moreover, does not our Lord say of those last sad times: "For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before"? Matt. 24, 24, 25.

Rom. 16, 17: Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.

Who causes "divisions and offenses" in the Church? St. Paul says they are caused by men that teach things "*contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned.*" From whom had the Christians at Rome learned *the doctrine*? From Paul the Apostle. From whom had he received it? He says to the Galatians: "I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ," Gal. 1, 11, 12. When, therefore, the apostle writes to the Romans of "*the doctrine which ye have learned.*" that doctrine was the doctrine of Jesus Christ, "the truth," in which we are to continue, according to the exhortation of our Lord, John 8, 31, 32. It is the Word of God, of which Peter says: "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," 1 Pet. 4, 11. This Word of Truth does not cause divisions and offenses; it unifies. By the devil's deceit and craftiness, however, men arise and teach *contrary to* the true doctrine. Arius denied the deity of Christ, and thus caused divisions in the Church and *offenses*, that is, causes for stumbling, so that people departed from the Truth. Pelagius denied the doctrine of original sin, and thus caused divisions and offenses. Thus Nestorius, Zwingli, Calvin, and a host of others taught "*contrary to the doctrine*"; thus "divisions and offenses" were caused.

The text says the false teachers teach "*contrary to*" the doctrine. The translation is good; Luther's translation, "*neben der Lehre*," is better. The Greek text reads: $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{a}$ $\tau\grave{\eta}\nu$ $\delta\imath\delta\alpha\chi\grave{\eta}\nu$ = "*beside* the doctrine which ye have learned." This closer translation of $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{a}$ = *beside*, gives us an insight into the method of the false teachers by which they endeavor to gain adherents for their false doctrines. They do not say: "Scripture teaches this and this doctrine, but we teach *contrary to* the explicit words of Scripture." No, the method of causing divisions and offenses is a subtle one. The false doctrines are taught *beside* the true doctrines. Apparently the false teachers adhere to the Word of God; they use the words of Scripture; but *beside*, under cover of, the Scripture they smuggle in their erroneous doctrines. In 2 Pet. 2, 1 we read of false prophets $o\tilde{\iota}\tau\nu\epsilon s$ $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\delta\zeta\sigma\sigma\nu$ $\alpha\grave{\iota}\rho\acute{e}\sigma\epsilon\iota\zeta$ $\grave{\alpha}\pi\omega\grave{\kappa}\epsilon\iota\zeta\iota\zeta$, "who *privily*," stealthily, "will bring in damnable heresies." The word "*privily*," stealthily, is to translate the $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{a}$ in the composite word $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\delta\zeta\sigma\sigma\nu$. With keen insight into the text Luther happily translates thus: "Sie werden *neben* einfuehren verderbliche Sekten." In Galatia the perverters of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to gain a hearing, and to make converts to their views, taught that the doctrine of justification as taught by St. Paul was good. Justification by faith in Christ Jesus—why, sure, that is a good doctrine, as far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough. In order to be saved, you must also be circumcised, you must "observe days and months and times and years." Thus, "*beside* the doctrine" the Galatians had learned, these perverters taught their own perverse things: Justification by faith + circumcision; justification by faith + observing days and months. By teaching this "*beside*"-doctrine, they mixed error with truth. And the result? The truth was destroyed. What does Paul say to this plus annexed to the doctrine of justification? "I marvel that ye are so soon *removed from* *Him* that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel, which is *not another*," *i. e.*, which is not Gospel at all, Gal. 1, 6. "If any man

preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed," v. 9. Again: "Christ is become of none effect unto you whosoever of you are justified by the Law; *ye are fallen from grace*," Gal. 5, 4.

The Pope hypocritically avows full acceptance of the Scriptures as the Word of God, but *beside* this statement he places that other one: The traditions are of equal authority with the Bible, thus making the Word of God of none effect. And when the synergists say that conversion and salvation indeed depend on the grace of God, but to some extent also on the conduct of man, the latter assertion is an assertion *beside* the doctrine, and annuls the former.—Let these instances suffice.

Now, when we observe such deviations from the truth, what are we to do? Are we to view them with indifference? No. The apostle is very earnest in his appeal: "*I beseech you, brethren*," for there is great danger for your souls' salvation; "*mark them*"—consider attentively them—"which cause divisions and offenses." For what purpose? "*Avoid them*," *ἀποκλίνετε ἀπ' ὁμιλῶν*, i. e., turn away from them, give them no hearing.

In the light of this passage judge of the union services as practised by various denominations. Observe, too, how strongly it condemns pulpit-fellowship and altar-fellowship with errorists.

It pains us, it is true, to keep aloof from all other denominations, but here is the command of God: "*Avoid them!*" This command is clear; we cannot refuse obedience to God.

2 Cor. 6, 14-18: *Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them and*

walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be My sons and daughters. saith the Lord Almighty.

It required a great deal of self-denial on the part of the Corinthian Christians to sever all fellowship with those former friends and associates who had remained unbelievers. This the apostle knew; but it must be done.—In order to gain a favorable hearing, he assures them of his love, vv. 11—13. He speaks to them as to “his children.” Children will listen to the warning of a loving father. And warn them he must —their salvation was at stake.

The *warning* reads: “Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers.” The *reasons* for this warning follow in five rhetorical questions, which appeal to their Christian consciousness, and admit of but one answer. We observe that the idea “yoked together” in the topic sentence is developed by the words: fellowship, communion, concord, what part, agreement. The accumulated contrasts in the questions are most impressive, and were to convince the Corinthians of the fact: it is wrong to be “unequally yoked together with unbelievers”; hence the *demand* is made: “Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate.”

“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers.” Paul has in mind the yoking together of an ox and an ass, of a clean and an unclean animal, in violation of the Law, Deut. 22, 9, 10. An apt portrayal, indeed, of a Christian having fellowship with an unbeliever. The two are too unlike to be put under one yoke.

Why should the Corinthian Christians not be yoked together with unbelievers? “For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?” None. The one is the very opposite of the other. The believer, doing righteousness, running the way of God’s commandments, cannot, at the same time, “walk in the counsel of the ungodly, nor stand in the way of

sinners, nor sit in the seat of the scornful," Ps. 1.—"What communion hath light with darkness?" Light and darkness exclude each other. The believers are the children of light, the light of the world, John 12, 36; Eph. 5, 8. 9; Matt. 5, 14; the unbelievers are darkness, love darkness, walk in darkness, and hate the light, John 3, 19. 20. What communion between the two? None. How unreasonable, therefore, for Christians to be yoked together with them! How unreasonable, for example, for a Christian to belong to the godless lodge! "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" Is a greater contrast imaginable—Belial, the devil, the father of lies, the murderer of men's souls, and Christ, the Truth, the Life, the Savior? You cannot serve two masters. Like master, like servant. Hence, ye Christians, the redeemed of Christ, be ye not unequally yoked together with the slaves and tools of Satan.—"What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" To the believer the Gospel is "the wisdom of God," to the unbeliever "the things of the Spirit," the Gospel, are foolishness, 1 Cor. 2. What have the two in common? Nothing. Hence, be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers.—"What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For ye are the temple of the living God." Idols are *dead* things,—these the unbelievers serve, to such they offer their sacrifices. You Christians serve the *living* God; He dwells in you, walks in you, He is your God, and you are His people. And you, "the temple of the living God," would be yoked together with unbelievers, the habitation of Belial? Impossible! Since you are *internally* separate from them, you should and must be *externally* separate. A fellowship, a communion, a concord, an agreement, with them is out of the question. There is but one course to take: "Come out from among them, and be ye separate." This is the Lord's command. (Cf. Eph. 5, 11.)

What holds good concerning our attitude over against unbelievers holds good also towards those of a false faith. They are simply unbelievers regarding those doctrines in which they differ from the Bible. Methodists, Baptists, *et al.* do not be-

lieve, *e. g.*, the words of Christ: "This is My body." Hence, in so far and inasmuch as they do not believe these and other words of Scripture, they are *unbelievers*. "Be not unequally yoked together with them." All false doctrine comes from Belial, not from Christ; false doctrine is darkness, sound doctrine is light from above. True doctrine and false doctrine are separated from each other as far as are heaven and earth, Christ and Belial. Hence, be separate, go out from among them, do not participate in their services; in church-affairs have nothing in common with them. (Cf. *Smalcald Articles*, p. 337. Study 1 Cor. 5, 9. 10.)

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

THE FIRST ENCYCLICAL OF BENEDICT XV.

On All Saints' Day, November 1, 1914, the new Pope issued his first circular letter "to the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Ordinaries in peace and communion with the Holy See." Following the established custom of naming official deliverances of the popes from their initial words, the document will be known and quoted under the title *Ad beatissimi Apostolorum*. Alluding to his recent elevation to "the chair of the Blessed Prince of the Apostles," which Benedict XV claims to have occurred "by the inscrutable design of divine Providence, without any merit on our part," the new Pope promulgates in this encyclical his administrative program. Having affirmed his belief in the primacy of Peter, he transfers to himself the commission given to Peter: "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep," and is overpowered "with the deepest feeling of charity" in view of the immensity of the flock entrusted to his care, "because under one aspect or another it embraces all men." On the basis of the universal redemption of Christ, he holds, the Church is instructed, not only to care for that part of the human race which is already in the

fold, but also to "lovingly compel the others to come in." Accordingly, he declares: "The first sentiment we experienced in our soul, and which was assuredly excited there by the divine goodness, was a certain incredible impulse of zeal and love for the salvation of all men." (p. 656; p. 669.)¹⁾

On close inspection this papal program of universal salvation reduces itself to one point: the recognition by all men of the pope "as the common father of all men." (*ibid.*) He divides his encyclical into two parts: the first he addresses to "the civil society," the second, to the church. To the former he introduces himself as the peace-bringer. "May the merciful God grant that, as on the appearance of the divine Redeemer upon the earth, so at the beginning of our duty as His vicar the angels' voices may proclaim, 'Peace on earth to men of good will.'" He exhorts the nations not to permit his "paternal voice to be raised in vain." (p. 657; p. 670.) He reminds them that, "in face of their criminal mode of thinking and acting by which the constitution of human society is perverted," he has been "raised up by God to guard the truth." (p. 659; p. 672.) The separation of "the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Church from public instruction" he considers the source of all disturbances in modern society. (p. 660; p. 673.) Speaking to the Church, he takes "as addressed to himself what God said to the prophet: 'Lo, I have set thee this day over the nations and over kingdoms to root up and to pull down, . . . and to build and to plant.'" (*Nota bene*: This statement was wisely not embodied in the first part, because the Church is better prepared to receive it.) (p. 663; p. 676.) He warns every "private person" not to "assume the position of a master in the Church," but to "follow especially the guidance of him whom Christ has constituted the guardian and interpreter of the truth." (p. 664 f.; p. 677 f.) Catholic associations are expected to know that, in order to be

1) References in this article are to the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, October, 1914: the first number refers to the Latin original, the second to the official English translation.

successful, they must "obey God by being obedient to the head of the Church," by "constantly and faithfully obeying the directions which have been, or will be, given to them by this Apostolic See." (p. 665; p. 679.)

It is an autocrat of the old school of papal absolutism that has been enthroned at the Vatican last September. Stubbornly as his predecessors he clamors for the restoration of his civil power. "For a long time now the Church has not enjoyed the complete liberty of which she has need; that is, since her head, the Sovereign Pontiff, has been deprived of the protection which by the will of divine Providence he obtained in the course of ages to safeguard that liberty. The result of depriving him of that protection was, as was inevitable, serious anxiety among Catholics, for all who profess to be sons of the Roman Pontiff—those who are at a distance, as well as those who are near—have a perfect and undeniable right to demand that their common father should be really and entirely free in the exercise of his apostolic ministry. Therefore, whilst most wishful that peace should be restored amongst the nations as soon as possible, we also desire that the abnormal condition in which the head of the Church finds himself, and which in many respects is highly injurious to the peace of peoples, should cease. We accordingly renew on the same grounds the protests on this subject which our predecessors made on several occasions, moved not by human considerations, but by the sacred sense of duty, —the duty, namely, of defending the rights and dignity of the Apostolic See." (p. 667; p. 680 f.) This appeal has been placed close to the end of the encyclical: it is the last serious matter which is on the Pope's mind, and he would have the report of this matter linger longest in the memory of men.

The old spirit of papal arrogance and ambition, then, pervades this first pronunciamento of the reigning Pope, but it has learned to speak in most endearing terms. Love is the keynote of the Pope's message; it breathes peace and good will toward all men. The pathos of the present world-tragedy

that is being enacted in the heart of Europe is eloquently expressed. There is apparently sincere grief over acts of injustice in the social body, and a proper plea for cooperation on the part of Catholics. Take, for instance, this fine word-picture of the horrors of the European war with its magnificent climax: "The fearful apparition of war is prominent everywhere, and nothing else engages men's attention. Great and flourishing nations are on the battlefields. Can we wonder that, as they are well supplied with those terrible means of destruction which the military art has invented, they fight against one another with awful butchery? There is no limit to the ruin and slaughter; every day the earth is drenched with fresh blood, and is covered with the wounded and the dead. And who would say that such men, armed one against the other, come from the same progenitor, that they are all possessed of the same nature, and that all belong to the same human society? Who would take them to be brothers, the sons of our Father who is in heaven? Whilst on every side furious battles are being fought with vast forces, nations, families, and individuals are oppressed by sorrow; day by day the number of widows and orphans increases immensely. Commerce languishes owing to the interruption of communications, the fields are empty, the arts are neglected, the rich are in poverty, the poor in squalor, and all are in grief." (p. 656 f.; p. 669 f.) Or this delineation of the haughty *Zeitgeist*: "The authority of those who are in power is no longer respected. From the time when all human power sought to emancipate itself from God, the Creator and Father of the universe, and to attribute its origin to man's free will, the bonds between superiors and inferiors have become so weak that they seem almost to have disappeared. An immoderate spirit of independence, combined with pride, has spread everywhere, invading even the family, whose authority so clearly arises from nature, and, what is more deplorable, it does not even stop at the steps of the sanctuary. Hence the contempt for laws, the insubordination of the masses, the saucy criticism of the commands of authority,

the numerous ways discovered for eluding discipline, and the frightful crimes of those who profess anarchy and do not hesitate to destroy the lives and property of others." (p. 659; p. 672.) Or this invective against Modernists: "Inflated and carried away by the great opinion they have formed of the human mind, which, thank God, has made astonishing progress in the study of nature, some, trusting in their own judgment, have spurned the authority of the Church, and in their temerity have gone so far as not to hesitate to measure with their intelligence and to adapt to the mode of thinking of these times the very mysteries of God and God's whole revelation to men. Therefore, there have arisen the monstrous errors of Modernism, which our predecessor rightly termed 'the synthesis of all heresies,' and solemnly condemned. This condemnation, venerable brethren, we here renew in its full extent, and since the contagion, which is so pestiferous, has not been entirely removed and yet creeps about here and there secretly, we exhort all to guard with great care against the danger of being infected by it. To it may fittingly be applied the words Job used of another matter: 'It is a fire that devoureth even to destruction, and rooteth up all things that spring.' (31, 12.) And we desire that Catholics should not only keep clear of the errors, but also of the tendency, and what is called the spirit, of the Modernists. Whoever is affected by this spirit rejects disdainfully whatever savors of antiquity, but eagerly searches for novelties everywhere—in the manner of speaking of divine things, in the celebration of divine worship, in the Catholic institutions, and in the private exercise of piety." (p. 665; p. 678 f.)

These are sentiments which, in a measure at least, could be expressed, in fact, are expressed, outside of the Roman Church, however from altogether different premises and for a different purpose. The hoary lie of papal supremacy in all things temporal and spiritual comes robed in the garments of heavenly truth, and steps demurely, and strikes affectingly reverent poses. There is here no trace of the old bluster and

holy bravado of the Bonifaces and Innocents and Urbans of yore. Though he would most certainly disavow it, Benedict XV, while denouncing Modernism, mutely defers to the spirit of the age, which dislikes and disavows even in Rome's own camp the fierce hierarchical tone of a former age. Rome never changes,—in essence,—but Rome ever varies the forms and methods of its activity, and is an adept in the art of adaptation and accommodation.

Particular interest attaches to the *ordo salutis* that this Pope proposes for the salvation of all men which he has made his program. For the temporal salvation of the civil society from all the ills which now prey upon it he proposes "a Christian philosophy," the foundation of which was laid in the Sermon on the Mount. (p. 662; p. 675.) The "beatitudes of man on earth" may not stop wars among nations, or correct the "disorders that have arisen in the human society, such as contempt for authority, want of mutual love amongst men, injustice in the relations between the different classes of society, and material welfare made the object of man's activity" (p. 658; p. 671), but they will reconcile men to the sorrows, cares, and miseries of this life, and teach them patience, whereby they will, in the end, "obtain access for themselves to those perfect and everlasting good things 'which God hath prepared for them that love Him.' (1 Cor. 2, 9.)" (p. 662; p. 675.) This Christian philosophy, together with the law of love which the Lord inculcated, will defeat the Socialists, "the perverse schools in which the heart of the young is fashioned like wax," *i. e.*, the non-religious state-schools, and the "writings which daily or at intervals mold the minds of the inexperienced masses, and other means by which public opinion is directed" (p. 661; p. 674), *i. e.*, the secular press, lyceum, chautauqua, etc., as far as it is not pro-Catholic.

To insure the continuous and efficient application of these means of papal salvation, "let princes and rulers of the people . . . reflect well whether it is a wise policy to separate the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Church from public instruction.

Sad experience shows that where religion has been banished, there human authority is despised. . . . When those who rule over the people despise divine authority, the people, in their turn, mock at human authority." (p. 660; p. 673.)

The world that is to be "saved" according to this plan has every Christian's sympathy. No doubt, this plan will be admired by many, because every man is by nature a Pelagian, and likes Pelagian teaching, and this Pope is, like his whole Church, a Pelagian. But it will lead nowhere but to conceit and blindness, especially if the organs of public education and information are to be papalized.

The Church is advised to shun innovations, and to aid the solidarity which has been the boast of the Roman Church. Every layman must implicitly obey his priest in all matters in which *Roma locuta est*: every priest must maintain the most filial relation to his bishop, and all must remember "to whom God has given the teaching office in the Church; let him have the unrestricted right to speak as he thinks fit, when he wishes; it is the duty of others to tender him devout homage when he speaks, and to obey his words." (p. 664; p. 677.) This effort to render the Catholic societies more cohesive and compact will be greatly aided by piety among the laymen and sanctity such as befits their office among the priests. An effect that has not been stated will be that the entire Church, from the cardinal down to the humblest laymen, will be more easily controlled by the Curia and become more readily responsive when summoned for any manifestation of papal power.

We pointed out before the shockingly improper parallel which the Pope desires to see realized between the *Gloria in excelsis* sung at the birth of the Prince of Peace, and to be repeated when the present war in Europe shall have been concluded through the paternal offices of this Pope. We also noted the ominous conclusion of this encyclical, which links most emphatically the restoration of world-peace with the restoration of the civil power of the Pope in the old papal states. Political events in Europe and the trend of European diplo-

macy are Rome-ward, to judge from recent developments in London, Paris, and Berlin. The Roman hierarchy intends to use any political advantage which the present political situation in Europe may open up to it to the limit. The Pope's influence, we imagine, can be had for the price of the restoration of the "*patrimonium Petri*."

D.

MATERIALS FOR THE CATECHIST.

FOURTH OUTLINE.

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT. Qu. 13—16.

I. The Form of This and the Other Commandments and of Luther's Explanation.

A. "The first question that arises here is, Why does He not issue the commandments in the affirmative (declarative) form, thus: 'Thou shalt have the one true God,' or: 'Worship me, the only God'? The second question that arises is, Why does He not speak in the imperative, but in the indicative mood?¹⁾ I answer both questions at once: Every commandment of God has been issued to indicate sins that have been committed or are being committed rather than such as may be committed at some future time. Accordingly, Paul says, Rom. 3, 20: 'By the Law is the knowledge of sin'; again, Rom. 11, 32: 'God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all.' Hence, when the commandment of God approaches man, it finds him already a sinner, and increases his sinfulness, 'that the offense might abound,' Rom. 5, 20. The laws of men, however, are issued against future sins. For this reason the Holy Spirit, who is an exceedingly kind teacher, prefers to speak in the indicative mood, as if He wished to say: Poor man, see, I am showing you your corruption. This is how you should be, *viz.*, you should have no idols, you should not misuse God's name, you should keep holy the Sabbath-day, you should not kill, covet, etc. But your present condition is altogether perverse. Lastly, this is the reason, too, why He issues His commandments in negative form; for a negation is stronger than an affirmation. Even the Samaritans in

1) Luther preached from the Latin text of the Vulgate: *Non habebis deos alienos*, and treated "habebis" as the indicative future.

olden times worshiped the one true God, but they worshiped their idol at the same time, just as the Jews and heathen, the pagans and wicked people do in our times. Now, throughout the world every person worships the one true God, who is ‘manifest in them’ all, Rom. 1, 19. But they do not combine His worship with that of their idols. Nor is there a man living who does not, in a manner, keep every commandment; for there is no one who does not at times omit misusing God’s name, or lying, or adultery, or theft. Still, they also do the contrary of all these things.” (Luther, III, 1154 f.)

B. The form of the commandments is not a mere formality. A commandment in negative form determines for us what is not a commandment in the affirmative, or directive, form, and vice versa. There is no other way for determining either. Of course, from a sin forbidden we naturally infer the opposite is enjoined, and *vice versa*. But this is not because we choose to draw such an inference, but because the Law written in our hearts, of which the decalog is merely the codification, compels us to draw that inference, and the numerous passages of scripture, which are expansions or illustrations of the Law, often reinforce a commandment expressed in negative form by declaring the opposite a duty, and inversely. In the matter of the divine code of morals there is no room for a neutral, or indifferent, position. A person can claim to have fulfilled a commandment that is stated negatively, if he has restrained from the sinful action forbidden without engaging in the corresponding good action. No commandment is transgressed by commissions only, nor by omissions only, but each commandment is transgressed in both these ways. The same rule applies to the fulfilment of the commandment. Luther’s explanation seeks to create the proper balance: he does not only specialize the general statement of the commandment, but where the commandment names the sin only, Luther names the corresponding good work, and *vice versa*.

II. The Prohibition. Qu. 13, 15.

1. The subject-matter prohibited: other gods besides God.

1. The omission of Ex. 19, 2 from Luther’s text of the First Commandment need not be regretted. These words will appear very appropriate in the Conclusion. Meanwhile the contrast contained in the commandment proper (“other gods before Me”) and in the proof-texts (Is. 42, 8: “the Lord — graven images”; Ps. 115, 3, 4: “our God — their idols”; Matt. 10, 28: “they which kill the body — He which is able to destroy,” etc.; Matt. 10, 37: “father and mother — Me”; Prov. 3, 5: “the Lord — thine own understanding”; Jer. 17, 5:

“man, flesh — the Lord”) is sufficient to cause the catechist to speak of God before he describes idols.

2. There would be no reason for this commandment if those people who say, “There is no God” (Ps. 14, 1), were right. But because there is a God, and He is the only one of His kind, this commandment is very necessary.

a. God is a person. He speaks of Himself as “I,” Is. 42, 8; Gen. 17, 1, and refers to Himself as a person in this commandment: “before Me.” He is spoken to in prayer, Ps. 73, 25, 26, and spoken of as a personal Being in every one of the proof-texts for this commandment.

b. He has a name: “The Lord, that is My name,” Is. 42, 8;² “I am the almighty God,” Gen. 17, 1.³

c. He is one Being, yet several persons: Father and Son, for instance, are alike God, John 5, 23 (comp.: “the kingdom of Christ and of God,” Eph. 5, 5). Jesus demands for Himself, Matt. 10, 37, what Jehovah claims for Himself, Is. 42, 8.⁴

d. He is elevated above all else as the omnipotent Creator, able to do anything He pleases, Ps. 115, 3; Matt. 10, 28.

3. Anything outside of God can never be what God is. All other things are creatures of God and in themselves good. If they are put in the place of God, they become “idols,” Ps. 115, 4. An idol is a fictitious, false God, practically a lie. In this commandment God turns against every creature that is set up as a god.

2) Gesenius, pointing to Ex. 3, 14, says: “The name Jehovah is derived from the verb **היה**, *to be*, and regarded as designating God as *eternal, immutable*, who will never be other than the same.” Rawlinson paraphrases Is. 42, 8 thus: “I am all that the name Jehovah signifies — self-existent, eternal, self-sufficing, independent, omnipotent, and therefore unique.” The force of the term Jehovah has, in the New Testament, passed over to **κύριος**, Matt. 4, 10.

3) “**אֱלֹהִים**, participle of the verb **אָלֹה**, *strong, mighty, a mighty one, hero, champion*; next, *strength, power*. “To God is said, in Scripture, to belong whatever is excellent, distinguished, superior in its kind.” (Gesenius.) As to the other name in this text, **אֱלֹהִי**, Gesenius treated it as a *plurale majestaticum* from **אָלֹה**, *powerful*. His translator, Robinson, differs from him, saying: “More probable is it that **אֱלֹהִי**, which never takes the article, is to be regarded as a plural (of **אָלֹה**) with the suffix of the first person, after the analogy of the form **אָדָנִי**, and used at first in direct invocation of God; hence, *pr. mei potentes*, my God; but afterwards a name of God, as Almighty.”

4) The plural **אֱלֹהִים**, indicating the Trinity, occurs in Ps. 14, 1.

B. The action prohibited: having other gods before God.

1. Luther's "neben mir" and the English "before Me" both show, not that God will not suffer anything beside Him to exist, but to be regarded and treated as only He can be regarded and treated.⁵⁾

2. "Having" other gods means:

a. "Giving the glory" of the true God to, and bestowing "the praise" due Him upon, another that is not God, Is. 42, 8; or "worshiping" something as God, Matt. 4, 10; or, on the other hand, refusing "honor" to God, John 5, 23. Any religious act, such as prayer, offering of sacrifice, etc., performed to any being or thing outside of the true God, whether the act is private or public, is denounced as sin in this commandment.⁶⁾

5) **עַל־פָּנָי**, Ex. 20, 3, literally means "before My face," that is, "before Me," "before" being understood in the local, not in the modal (comparative), sense. There is a sphere into which nothing can be admitted that is not God. There is none "beside" Him, Is. 44, 6, 8; 45, 18. The true religion is monotheism, not polytheism, nor pantheism, nor atheism.

6) **כְּבָרַת** (ל) to give honor to, Is. 42, 8, is a common Hebrew phrase signifying adoration of the Deity; and **τιμή** is a religious hypon, such as David composed for the worship of Jehovah. In Matt. 4, 10 **προσκυνέω** refers to prostrations and other acts of adoration before the Deity, while **τιμέω** signifies every act of obedience rendered to God, whether at a religious service, festival, sacrifice, etc., ordained by Him, or in that service to our fellow-men which the true God has made a part of that practical worship which He demands of His followers. In John 5, 23 **τιμάω** expresses the awe and reverence with which the devout worshiper approaches God. — The English "worship" is derived from an Anglo-Saxon root that means to deem worthy. Not so long ago it was the exact equivalent of the Greek **τιμάω** = "honor," and was used also of the reverence and honor shown men, as in the marriage ritual of the Church of England, when the groom vows to the bride: "With my body I thee worship." In lodge idolatry we find a "worshipful" master. — Is. 42, 8, by the way, is a Messianic text, and represents Jehovah as the fulfiller of His gracious promises. Rev. Tuck has called attention to this, and linked the uniqueness of the only true God with the unique Savior: "Jehovah stands alone. All others must say, 'I was made'; He says: 'I am.' The distinction comes out very forcibly in relation to the idols which men worship. We know their origin in men's mental conceptions, or in men's handiwork. Of Jehovah we know nothing save that *He is*. But the prophet is far less concerned with the abstract nature of God than with His special and gracious relations with His people. He is here dealing with Jehovah's faithfulness to His predictions and promises. He is unique in this, — He keeps His word. The glory of fulfilling His promises belongs to Him alone. It was characteristic of idolatry that large promises were made to men by oracle and priest for which there was no guarantee; and there

b. To "fear," Matt. 10, 28, "love," Matt. 10, 37, "trust," Prov. 3, 5; Jer. 17, 5; cherish, Eph. 5, 5; Phil. 3, 19, anything in such a way that God becomes dislodged from man's chief affections.⁷⁾

c. A person engaging in an action of this kind is called an idolater, Eph. 5, 5, and his act, idolatry.⁸⁾

C. The principal forms of idolatry.

1. "All the children of Adam are idolatrous, and guilty of having transgressed this commandment. But we must know that there are two kinds of idolatry, one external, the other internal. External

is no more miserable chapter in the history of idols than the chapter of *excuses* for disappointed promise-holders. If the predictions of Jehovah ever failed, He would sink to lower levels than the idols. 'The voice that moves the stars along speaks all the promises.' The point on which to dwell is that, however tolerant idolatry may be of other conceptions and other rituals developed in other lands, and however attractive to men such latitude in religion and worship may be, not one jot of the absolutely supreme claims of Jehovah can be removed. In this no concession can be made. Here there can be no rivalry, no sharing of honors. God is God alone. He is above all. It is absolutely essential to the worship of Jehovah that it should be wholly exclusive of the idea of another god. No reproach of men can be more severe and searching than this, 'They feared the Lord, and served other gods.'"
(*Pulpit Comm.*)

7) *Φοβέομαι* in Matt. 10, 28 expresses the dread which seizes a person in the presence of a superior power, and sways his deliberations so as to make him submissive. *Φιλέω* in Matt. 10, 37 refers to the natural affections which grow out of consanguinity. Even these must be kept under strict control in the interest of sincere religiousness. *Πεπ* in Prov. 3, 5 and Jer. 17, 5 is the common term to express the act of placing hope and confidence in one. It is said to be derived from a root that signifies unloading a burden on another, in the belief that he is able and willing to bear it for you; hence, seeking actual relief in distress from a source that is greater than yourself. *ψύ* in its niphál form, in Prov. 3, 5, literally means to obtain rest by leaning upon a support. In Eph. 5, 5 *πλεορέκτης* is compounded out of *πλέον* + *τρέπειν*, to have more. This indicates an engrossing passion, and a similar passion is indicated in Phil. 3, 19.

8) In *εἰδωλολάτης* we have a compound noun, the latter half of which is derived from *λατρεύω*. (See Note 6.) The service due God is rendered by the idolater to an *εἰδωλον*, an apparition. The word is derived from *εἰδεσθαι*, to be seen. Cremer: "*Εἰδωλον*, connecting with *εἰδος*, signifies a picture in so far as it exhibits a figure, and emphasizes only the idea of its appearing, and that so strongly that the ultimate conception is that of semblance; it denotes a form that looks like something, seems to impersonate something." An idol is a phantom, a shadow without substance. There is nothing really divine in it; only the corrupt fancy of man imagines that it has discerned something divine in an idol. See 1 Cor. 8, 4.

idolatry is the worshiping of wooden or stone images, animals, stars, and is known to us from the Old Testament and from pagan writings. External idolatry, however, has grown out of internal idolatry, which latter consists in this that a person, moved either by the fear of punishment or the desire to secure some profit, while omitting the outward act of adoring a creature, nevertheless inwardly cherishes, and puts his confidence in, the creature. For must we not regard it as an act of worship when a person, indeed, does not bow the knee to wealth and honors, but still sacrifices his very best to obtain them, *viz.*, his heart and mind? Such an act would mean, worshiping God with the body and our physical limbs, while inwardly adoring the creature with one's spirit." (Luther, III, 1136.)

2. "External idolatry" is in our Catechism called "gross," that is, coarse, shocking, revolting, and repulsive, idolatry, and is defined thus: "actually to regard and adore a creature as God."

a. The oldest and most hideous form of idolatry is devil-worship. The proposition which Satan made to our Lord in the desert was made to Him as the representative of our race. This consideration carries us back to Eden. While we have no record that Adam and Eve performed the act of worshiping the devil, which was suggested to Christ, their compliance with the devil's schemes made the devil their god in the place of the true God. That the devil is the ulterior object in all pagan idol-worship is stated 1 Cor. 10, 20. *Luther*: "Here belong those also whose idolatry is most gross, and who make a covenant with the devil, in order that he may give them plenty of money, or help them in love-affairs, preserve their cattle, restore to them lost possessions, etc., as sorcerers and necromancers." (Large Cat., p. 392. Jacobs' Ed.)⁹

b. The worship of idols practised by the heathen is gross idolatry. "Their idols are silver and gold" at the best, — often mere wood and stone, Deut. 4, 28; but the idols of the Babylonians were mostly of the more precious materials (Herod. 1, 183; Dan. 3, 1; Ep. Jer. 1, 4, 11, etc.)" Isaiah has portrayed the manufacture of idols ch. 44, 12—17 (comp. Ps. 135, 15). "To avoid this reproach (*viz.*, that idols are the work of men's hands) some images were said to have fallen down from heaven." (Rawlinson.)¹⁰ — At the promulgation of the

9) Goethe's *Faust* is a panegyric on devil-worship.

10) Ps. 115, 3, 4, quoted in the Catechism, might be extended so as to embrace vv. 5—8, which depict the idols as "possessing a semblance of every organ of human sense, and yet wholly unable to perform any of the functions." That men should worship them, or believe in their power to help, is an utter absurdity." The Psalmist in this text calls idols עצבים.

Decalog on Sinai there was a distinct reference to this gross form of idolatry connected with the First Commandment, Ex. 20, 4. 5.¹¹⁾ The Israelites were not to make for purposes of worship any image¹²⁾ or any likeness "of anything that is in heaven above," that is, any winged creature of the air, or a stellar body, "nor in the earth beneath," like the calf that Aaron made for them, "nor that is in the water under the earth," like the fish-god Dagon of the Philistines, or the crocodile of Egyptian worship. In the remark, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them," lies a hint of what the pagans actually do.¹³⁾ Ex. 32, 1—6 affords good collateral reading at this

The word is derived from a root which means to cut, or carve. In Is. 42, 8 they are called פְּסִילִים, from a root that means to cut, or hew, out of stone.

11) The commandment against image-worship is the second in the enumeration of the Reformed Churches. Rawlinson gives the reason as follows: "As the First Commandment asserts the unity of God, and is a protest against polytheism, so the Second asserts His spirituality, and is a protest against idolatry and materialism." But Rev. Young remarks: "These two commandments seem to be bound together naturally by the reason given in v. 5. There Jehovah says, 'I am a jealous God'; obviously such a feeling of jealousy applies with as much force to the worship of other gods as to the making of graven images." (*Pulpit Comm.*) Luther calls the prohibition of images "the other part of the First Law, wherein God refrains us from having other gods. Who these other [strange] gods are He informs us in this text (vv. 3, 4), *viz.*, by telling them that they were not to have any images, neither of objects in heaven nor on earth, etc. That is: you shall not paint the sun, moon, stars, or make any image of man, beast, or fish." (III, 1043.) The Lutheran Church, while following the time-honored enumeration of the commandments, has always regarded the enumeration as a "res media et indifferens; non est canonicae autoritatis." The Lutherans at Strassburg, *e. g.*, in the days of Quenstedt, had the Reformed enumeration. What the Lutherans oppose in the Reformed teaching on this point is that the Reformed "hanc suam distributionem decalogi tanquam necessariam ecclesiae obtrudunt." (Quenstedt, who also catalogs the fanatical views of Reformed writers on this subject. See *Baier*, ed. Walther, III, p. 345 f.)

12) סְבִבָּה.

13) "Every outward sign of honor was shown to images in the ancient world. They were not regarded as emblems, but as actual embodiments of deity. There was a special rite in Greece (theopoeia) by means of which the gods were inducted into their statues, and made to take up their abodes in them. Seneca says of the Romans of his own day: 'They pray to these images of the gods, implore them *on bended knee*, sit or stand long days before them, throw them money, and sacrifice beasts to them, so treating them with deep respect, though they despise the man who made them.' " (Rawlinson.)

point. *Luther*: "The heathen who aimed at power and dominion elevated Jupiter as the supreme god; the others, who were bent upon riches, happiness, or pleasure and a life of ease, venerated Hercules, Mercury, Venus, or others. Women with child worshiped Diana or Lucina. Thus every one makes that to which his heart is inclined his god, so that even in the mind of the heathen to have a god is nothing but to trust and believe. But their error is this that their trust is false and wrong; for it is not placed in the only God, beside whom there is truly no other in heaven or upon earth. Wherefore the heathen really form their self-invented notions and dreams of God into an idol, and put their trust in that which is altogether nothing." (*Large Cat.*, p. 393.) ..

D.

(*To be concluded.*)

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:—

1. *AUSGEWAELTE PSALMEN*, ausgelegt von † Dr. G. Stoeckhardt. 82 pages. 70 cts.

Among the posthumous papers of the late exegete at Concordia Seminary was found a fascicle of expository matter on Psalms 1, 19, 2, 8, 40, 22, and 16, ready for publication. The author had been engaged on his Commentary on the Psalms, when death interrupted his labor. What a valuable addition to our expository literature his commentary would have been these few pages abundantly testify. Learning and reverence for the Scriptures, exegetical skill and practical judgment, are manifested on every page. The Church owes thanks to Dr. Stoeckhardt's widow and to the publisher for saving this little nugget from oblivion.

2. *BRIEFE VON C. F. W. WALTHER AN SEINE FREUNDE, SYNODALGENOSSEN UND FAMILIENGLIEDER*, herausgegeben von L. Fuerbringer. Erster Band: Briefe aus den Jahren 1841—1865. 240 pages. \$1.00.

This first instalment of a contemplated series of "Letters of Walther" contains 112 letters, most of which were available in manuscript, while the rest are reprints. The omissions noted in the text are due to the condition of the manuscripts or of the original print, and to slight editing applied to personal remarks. The addressees of these letters are: Rev. H. Fick (20), Dr. W. Sihler (15), Rev. O. Fuerbringer (12), Dr. Walther's wife, and his son-in-law, Rev. St. Keyl (each 8), Rev. F. Lochner and Dr. H. C. Schwan (each 6), Rev. F. Brunn (5), Rev. J. C. W. Lindemann, Rev. J. A. Ottesen, and Rev. F. Sievers (each 4), Rev. A. Ernst and Rev. J. Walther (each 3), Rev. Th. Brohm, Rev. A. F. Hoppe, Rev. E. G. W. Keyl, and Dr. A. Marbach (each 2), Rev. E. A. Brauer, Mr. Eggen, Trinity Congregation at St. Louis, Rev. C. A. Preuss, the St. Louis District Conference, and Walther's son Ferdinand (each one). To apply to

this collection the threadbare phrase "interesting" would be damning the meritorious undertaking with faint praise. These letters will prove fascinating reading to the average peruser; to the critical student of the history of the Missouri Synod they are an invaluable source of information. They aid in clarifying or shading the judgment on some of the important events in the formative period of our church-body. This undertaking should be placed beyond all hazards. The Church needs these letters, and there should be no question about the publication of the remaining letters in the hands of the editor, whose work should earn the commendation of all.

3. *REICHTREDEN UEBER ALT- UND NEUTESTAMENTLICHE TEXTE.* Gesammelt von *H. Bouman.* 164 pages. 75 cts.

Thirty-one addresses to communicants by as many authors are here offered partly as models to young pastors, partly as aids to the busy pastor, partly as preparatory meditations to communicants in general. The "confessional address" has ever been regarded as evidence of the solid sensorium of the Lutheran Church as regards the sacred and important act of communing, and of the pastor's responsibility in relation to that act. A *worthy* communicant is one of the legitimate products of an able Lutheran ministry. This volume, therefore, starts on a laudable mission. God speed it!

4. *WHAT THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH STANDS FOR.* A Statement of Lutheran Principles. By *Th. Graebner.* Dozen, 10 cts.; 100, 50 cts.

This four-page tract declares the sum and substance on the fundamental facts of confessional Lutheranism, and on its relation to such modern issues as education, church-union, separation of Church and State, prohibition, and war. It is designed for wide distribution among the masses wherever the English language is spoken, and assures the purpose of ready and succinct information well.

Rev. W. M. Czamanske, Sheboygan, Wis., has issued in pamphlet form the stirring Reformation sermon which *Prof. E. Hore* preached from 1 Pet. 1, 25 at Milwaukee, November 8, 1914. Price, 5 cts.

Verlag des Schriftenvereins, Zwickau, Saxony: —

"KOMMT, WIR WOLLEN WIEDER ZUM HERRN!" Dreissig Andachten fuer die Kriegszeit. Von *Martin Willkomm.* 49 pages. 40 Pf.

Thirty meditations on pertinent Scripture-texts — enough for one month — are here offered to soldiers in the field and to their loved ones at home. A tender, precious link is thus woven out of Bible words that binds those who go out to die with the living they have left behind them. The meditations are clear testimonies of Christian faith, Christian hope, and Christian charity. Would that they could be reproduced in English, French, and Russian, and conveyed to the soldiers on the other side! They would help to take much of the shocking bitterness out of this European warfare.

The Lutheran Publ. Co., Ltd., Hochkirch, Victoria, Australia:—CHURCH LITURGY FOR EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CONGREGATIONS IN AUSTRALIA. Published by the Pastors of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Australia. VIII and 226 pages, with musical supplement of 11 pages. \$5.00.

The wealth of liturgical material offered in this tastefully printed and bound volume deserves to be exhibited in detail. Part I, pp. 3—37, contains nine different orders of service. Beginning with the regular order of service on Sundays and holy-days with Communion, which follows, in its essential features, the order of the old Lutheran liturgies, and resembles in many parts the order adopted by our *Agende*, we note as a distinctive feature a number of intercessory prayers that our *Agende* lacks (for the sick, for persons spiritually afflicted, for reception of new members, restoration, announcements relating to cases of church-discipline, etc.). Next there is an order of service each for afternoon or evening services, for catechetical instruction, for a Lenten service, for a synodical service, for a mission festival, for the Day of Repentance, for Christmas Eve, and for a reading service conducted by a lector. In Part II, pp. 43—76, there are antiphonies and collects, two each, for every Sunday and holy-day in the church-year, with the text-references to the old pericopes. In Part III, pp. 79—141, we have forms for ministerial acts, five for baptism, three for the churching of women, two for confirmation, one for confession before Communion, one for restoration, three for marriage, three for communion of the sick, a prayer for the dying, a burial service, four forms relating to the ordination and installation of a pastor, a form for the reception of new members, one for a corner-stone-laying, and six for dedicatory services (church, school, organ, bell, cemetery, dwelling). Part IV, pp. 145—182, contains antiphonies and collects for holy-days that were not provided for in Part II, and general and special collects. Part V, pp. 183—217, contains what is known in our circles as "Kanzelgebete," general prayers for the common Sunday services and for festival seasons and special occasions. To this part is added the History of the Passion and Death of our Lord.—The work is done with an evident desire to cover the needs of the average Lutheran pastorate; it breathes the reverent spirit of the Lutheran worship, and exhibits the stately dignity of confessional Lutheran consciousness. In the ordination service there remains the old desideratum that has been expressed also with reference to our Missouri *Agende*: the transfer of the ministry should be related directly to the call. In the marriage service we note the omission of the word "obey" in the answer of the bride, though the remaining portions of the service set forth the Scriptural relation of wife to husband.

Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.:—

1. *LENTEN OUTLINES AND SERMONS.* By Rev. R. E. Goldaday, A. M., B. D., and Others. 687 pages. \$2.00.

As regards both quantity and quality, there is no church that can boast such a Lenten literature as the Lutheran. Often, too, the poorest Lutheran author will appear at his best when writing on the

Passion of the Lord. This literature may be regarded as one of the practical results of the banner doctrine of the Lutheran faith: justification by grace through faith in the Redeemer's vicarious living and dying. This is an inexhaustible theme, and it is proper that it should be treated again and again. In the present collection of 74 Lenten outlines and 29 Lenten sermons by six different authors the theologian will find able reproductions of matter that he has seen elsewhere in German, and will rejoice to have it in the vernacular. But there is also an abundance of new material, well digested and arranged. The entire book will serve its purpose of bringing an aid to the busy pastor well, and if there are any pastors who are not busy, the outlines here offered are apt to make them busy elaborating effective Lenten sermons.

2. *DAILY EXERCISES UNTO GODLINESS.* For Use in the Pew and at the Altar of the Home Sanctuary. Based on the calendar of the church-year. By C. H. L. Schuette. 592 pages. \$2.00.

Two separate meditations on a Scripture-text, followed by a prayer, are here offered for use at the morning and evening devotions conducted at Christian homes. Moreover, the author — no doubt, to obviate the perfunctoriness attending the family devotions not infrequently — suggests that each devotion be opened with the invocation of the Trinity and an appropriate versicle. He suggests a sufficient number. Then is to follow the meditation noted above, and after this the recitation of the Ten Commandments in the morning and of the Creed in the evening. The family service is concluded with the Lord's Prayer and the Old Testament benediction in the morning and the New Testament benediction in the evening. The plan is good, no matter how many will be able to execute it in their families. For the week-days the exposition of the Scripture text is omitted, and there is only a prayer, based, however, on, and impressing on the hearers, the truth contained in the text. On Saturdays poetry from the Ohio Synod's *Hymnal* takes the place of the prayer.

3. *SCHOOL CAROLS.* A Collection of Hymns for the Sunday-schools. 320 pages. 50 ets.

Three hundred and fifty-one standard hymns for children have been appropriately grouped according to the sequence of the church-seasons or the subject-matter, and a tune provided for each. An order of service for opening and closing the Sunday-school, a select number of Psalms, and prayers are offered in connection with the hymns.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, N. Y.:—

ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. Edited by James Hastings, with the assistance of John A. Selbie, M. A., D. D., and Louis H. Gray, M. A., Ph. D. Vol. VII: Hymns to Liberty. 911 pages.

The general character of this *Encyclopedia* has been exhibited to our readers in notices of previous volumes. The present volume

contains 203 titles, not counting cross references. One hundred and eighty-three authors have collaborated in its production, and thirteen articles are of composite authorship. These latter, embracing such subjects as Hymns, Images and Idols, Incarnation, Inheritance, Inspiration, Law, Liberty, are especially rich in information. Such subjects as Index, Indulgences, Immaculate Conception, Inquisition, Jesuits, are treated by Roman Catholics. Biographical articles, like those on Ibsen, Josephus, Jerome, Kant, Kierkegaard, Leibnitz, Lessing; geographical, historical, and ethnological articles, like those on Judaism, Indo-China, Japan, Italy, Indonesians, Korea, Israel, Iranians; philosophical articles, like those on Inference, Judgment, Individualism, Introspection, Invincible Ignorance, Intellectualism, Indifferentism, Immanence, Imagination, Intelligence, Libertarianism and Necessitarianism; and last, not least, theological articles, like Image of God, Imputation, Implicit Faith, Interpretation, Kingdom of God, Jesus Christ, Immortality, show the range and variety of the contents of this great work. We are sure that hardly any one except a scholar is aided toward an adequate conception of the scope of this *Encyclopedie* by a mere enumeration of titles. Still, to do some justice to the enterprise such an enumeration seems necessary. The spirit of the workmen who have been engaged upon this volume, and the quality of their workmanship, can be exhibited in a manner by noting some of the opinions rendered. We select a few that will interest Lutherans and theologians. Says Crippen: "For practical purposes the history of modern hymnody begins with the publication, in 1524, at Erfurt and Wittenberg, respectively, of two small books of German hymns, in each of which about three-fourths of the contents were from the pen of Luther. . . . As long as the German language endures, men will sing Luther's pathetic 'Aus tiefer Not,' his childlike 'Vom Himmel hoch, da komm' ich her,' and his immortal 'Ein' feste Burg.'" (p. 28 f.) Davidson's article on the "Image of God" exhaustively treats the pertinent texts in both Testaments, and skilfully exhibits the renewal of the lost image under the general idea of conformity to Christ, without claiming that the image of God was, as some contend, from the start the image of Christ. (p. 160 f.) Mackintosh, on "Implicit Faith," rightly credits Luther with having been "the first to protest against the general notion" (of i. f.). He says that it is very absurd to decorate with the name of faith what is merely "ignorance tempered with humility." (p. 180.) Frank's "Imputation" and Simpson's "Justification" are cognate. In the former article Luther and Brenz should have been consulted directly as regards the *imputatio culpae* and the *impulatio justitiae Christi*, rather than by way of Hodge, Schmid, Lipsius, and Loofs. (p. 181.) In the latter article justification is indeed understood to be "equivalent to the forgiveness of sins," but the quality of justifying faith, which is nothing else than the apprehension of the righteousness of Christ, will be perverted by speaking of faith as "the pledge of the personal, ethical relation to God," or by declaring "confidence" to be "faith aware of itself." Justifying faith is justifying only by reason of what it has and holds, never by reason of what it is. (p. 615 f.) The composite article on "Incarnation" is wholly ethnological; the incarnation of the Logos being

treated in Mackenzie's "Jesus-Christ." (p. 515 ff.). Boudhimon's article on "Indulgences" is apologetic, and reiterates every essential claim of the Roman Church in this matter. Luther's "revolt" was from a "doctrine that was sound," while "appearances were evil." (p. 251.) Cartis ("Infallibility") denies that the infallibility of Scripture consists "in absolute immunity from error in matters of historical and scientific fact," but holds that the aggregate of blemishes of this kind in the Bible "is so slight as to be practically negligible." (p. 262 f.)

George H. Doran Co., New York, N. Y.:—

1. *CHRISTIAN FREEDOM.* By William Malcolm Macgregor, D. D. 428 pages. \$1.50.

The Baird Lectures for 1913, which are presented under the above title, have a special attraction for Lutheran readers because of the frequent references to Luther's letters and his Exposition of Galatians. In fact, the author's principal thought has been suggested by Paul's utterances in Galatians and Luther's comment, though the elaboration of the thought is decked out with much of the most modern thought in copious, interesting, and embellishing quotations, enhancing the style of the book, and indicative of the author's copious reading. The eight chapters in this book, every one of them fascinatingly written, are a plea for individualism in religion. The masses, following the gregarious instinct of ordinary men, are herded in the Church, accept contentedly what is offered them, submit to established forms, prevailing customs, and do not feel the tyranny of tradition. Thus they remain slaves at heart and stagnate. Ever and anon some one rises, like Luther, Pascal, Vinet, Barclay, who challenges the solidarity of the ecclesiastical organism on some question that has become vital to him owing to his free spiritual development. Throughout his treatise the author asserts the supremacy of the individual experience of God, and he goes so far as to declare Nietzsche's *Christian Aphorisms* and Herrenmoral "Christian and Pauline utterances." Here lies the fatal weakness of the book: heterogeneous elements are treated as homogeneous, and the vast difference of being made free by the Son and His Word, and of being made free from the Son and His Word, is lost.

2. *THE OLD TESTAMENT IN LIFE AND LITERATURE.* By Jane T. Stoddart. Third Edition. 512 pages. \$2.25.

This collection of remarkable utterances and striking references to Scripture texts, or facts, of the Old Testament by famous men met with immediate favor at its first appearance, and now that it is out in its third edition the public is eagerly awaiting the companion volume on the New Testament by the same authoress, which has been promised. On texts from every book of the Old Testament there are here cited illuminating sayings, and the source is carefully given, we believe, in every instance. Lutheran readers will be specially grateful for the quotations from the Enders-Kawerau collection of Luther's letters, which is now nearing completion, and from the *Corpus Reformatorum*. Needless to say that the citations

are not all equally vigorous, beautiful, or impressive; but, upon the whole, sound judgment and good taste are apparent in the selection of quotable matter.

3. *THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY* (Vol. 3, No. 1) contains articles by the Bishop of Winchester on The Topic of Unity, Erich Schaefer on Theocentric Theology in Peace and in War, W. B. Selbie on The Churches, the War and the Future, S. Michelet on The Present Theological Crisis in the Church of Norway, Bishop McConnell on Ecclesiastical Honesty, and others.

Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston:—

1. *IS CONSCIENCE AN EMOTION?* Three Lectures on Recent Ethical Theories, by *Hastings Ransdall*. 200 pages. \$1.00.

An Oxford scholar delivered the Raymond F. West Memorial Lectures at the Leland Stanford Junior University in 1913, and this book is the result. The old question that has been debated since Plato and Epicurus, whether moral distinctions in us are the work of reason or sudden emotions arising in us, whether the conscience is of the head or the heart, whether it should be called "Moral Reason" or "Moral Sense," is here taken up again with a commanding grasp of the facts of the controversy through more than twenty centuries, and set forth, especially in the first lecture, in a very lively, engaging manner, that arrests and holds the attention, also the immense practical importance of this discussion, *viz.*, whether our moral judgments are divinely implanted in us and possess objective validity, or whether they are shifting, changing, kaleidoscopic creations of the feelings of pleasure or pain. The author holds to the Rationalist as over and against the Emotionalist view, and defends it against Westermank (*Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*) and McDougall (*Social Psychology*), and against the attempt made by the late Professor James, who identified the concept of "good" with mere "satisfaction" or "satisfactoriness."

2. *A CENTURY'S CHANGE IN RELIGION*. By *George Harris*. 267 pages. \$1.25.

The President Emeritus of Amherst College and former Professor in Andover Theological Seminary reviews in this volume the remarkable modifications which religious teaching and religious life in the Evangelical Churches, particularly in the Eastern States, have undergone. The waning of Calvinism, the rise of Unitarianism and Universalism, the advent of Evolution and Higher Criticism, and how these factors have affected such fundamental doctrines of the evangelical faith as the person of Christ, redemption and conversion, the spiritual life of believers, the Christian hope of eternal life, the character and activities of the Church,—all these events are made to pass in review before us while we listen to the accompanying tale of a guide who has watched the transformations of which he speaks, and knows to point out cause and effect in these historical phenomena with precision. The author's own standpoint may be gleaned from the last two chapters, "The Heritage of Faith," and "The Enlarge-

ment of Faith." He holds, briefly, that the great essentials of the Christian faith remain the same throughout the changes which he has portrayed, and will remain the same throughout changes yet to come, although the faith is "cleared of superfluities and contradictions." He regards the modern emphasis on the brotherhood of man and the growing opposition to militarism as a gain to the Christian faith. We hold that, both in what it has cast off and in what it is endeavoring to put on, our age is losing both the clearness of the knowledge and the vigor of the life of the old faith.

Sherman, French & Co., Boston:—

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By Richard H. K. Gill, A. M., Ph. D. 104 pp. \$1.00.

When an author starts out by saying: "We are not responsible for our being born with a sinful nature, nor are we condemned for it. For as in Adam all die, so in Christ, the second Adam, all are made alive again," we are beginning to entertain fears that the presentation of his subject will turn out all awry because of John 3, 6 and Eph. 2, 3. And, true to his promise, the author deduces from the fact of Christ's redemption "our probation and our being, also the incipient works of grace in the soul, placing every child of the fallen race in a justified state, in the kingdom of God, and in possession of the germ of life." He calls this, after Merrill, "the source of good that is in us all." This view plainly does away with hereditary guilt and the innate corruption of fallen man, and gives to the objective justification, which results from the vicarious work of the Redeemer, a meaning far beyond that expressed by the grand parallel which Paul draws in Rom. 5, 12 ff. Also in his terminology the Lutheran reader will have to be prepared for deviations from Lutheran usage; for the author is not a Lutheran. *E. g.*, "awakening" with our author is rousing "the voice of conscience" in a "soul that is dead in trespasses and sins." It appears, however, from the author's expatiation that this "awakening" may leave the soul still spiritually dead. Nevertheless, this book can be studied with great profit by evangelical pastors. In fact, the psychological object-lessons with which it abounds, exhibiting the manifestations of sin-consciousness and the attitudes of natural man towards regenerating grace, will forthwith attract the attention of pastors. We would group and value these psychological phenomena differently from the author, but it is an undeniable merit in the book that it draws attention to facts of the inner life of men which the curate of souls should fully understand.

Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York:—

THE DEAF. Their Position in Society and the Provision for their Education in the United States. By Harry Best. 340 pages. \$2.00.

In the series of special books on economics and sociology which the Crowell Company has been publishing, this volume occupies a

unique place. It is so rarely that a competent writer takes up the cause of the deaf, and gives a rational and sympathetic account of their social condition, and the efforts which State and Church are making to ameliorate their sad fate. It must be borne in mind, however, in justice to the author, that he has purposely presented the problem of the deaf from the view-point of the political economist or sociologist; that is to say, he does not discuss the medical or legal aspects of the problem, nor the merely human or charitable interest which their existence in society awakens, but he treats the deaf as a component part of our social organization. The effort which our Synod is making at North Detroit is noticed on page 203 as "the single Protestant school" of its kind in the country. All other religious schools for the deaf are under Roman Catholic auspices.

Fleming H. Revell Co., New York:—

THE ROMANCE OF PREACHING. By Charles Sylvester Horne.

With an Introduction by Charles R. Brown, D. D., and a Biographical Sketch by Howard A. Bridgman, D. D. 302 pp.
\$1.25.

It is customary at Yale that prior to their graduation the divinity students are addressed in a course of lectures by some eminent man in the churches here or in Great Britain on the work of the ministry, the functions of the pastoral office, chiefly on preaching. When the present lectures were delivered, it was reported that more than ordinary enthusiasm had been kindled among the students and pastors who heard the chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. This is accounted for, on the one hand, by the exquisite literary flavor with which these essays are redolent, on the other hand, by the spirited manner and the impressive force of personal conviction with which they were delivered. And these features constitute the merit of this book. Outside of them there is little of new thought on the theory and practise of preaching developed in the author's fine perorations. The first lecture is introductory, and emphasizes the necessity of the influence of the Spirit on the preacher. Six lectures are character-sketches of famous preachers,—the prophets, the apostles, Athanasius and Chrysostom, Savonarola, Calvin and Knox, Robinson and the Pilgrim Fathers, Wesley and Whitefield. The last lecture is an optimistic view of the mission of the modern preacher, calling the hearers to "high resolves" and heroic action against bigotry, to daring to do great things for Christ's sake, and the ideal of the author seems to have been expressed as in a climax in the dialog which Ibsen makes the prophet Brand and his wife Agnes speak: the proclamation of a "God of love and not of fear."

The National Home Rule Association of Cincinnati, O., has issued a pamphlet: *THE TWO BANNER PROHIBITION STATES.* Being a careful review of conditions in Maine and Kansas under prohibition legislation. The Secretary of State of Maine, Cyrus W. Davis, writes on his state, Hon. Royal E. Cabell, U. S. Commissioner of Internal Revenue under President Taft, writes on Kansas.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of International Law, has issued Pamphlet No. 2: *LIMITATION OF ARMAMENT ON THE GREAT LAKES*, and the *YEAR BOOK FOR 1918—14*.

B. G. Teubner, Leipzig:—

DR. MARTIN LUTHER. Ein Lebensbild fuer das deutsche Haus von Georg Buchwald. Zweite, vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage mit zahlreichen Abbildungen im Text und auf 16 Tafeln nach Kunstwerken der Zeit. IV and 516 pages. M. 8.

Fourteen years ago Dr. Buchwald came before the German-speaking Protestant world with the proposition that the Life of Luther which he had just published might be read in the Christian homes in the family-circle. His book possessed, indeed, all the features that would adapt it for such use: simplicity of style, lively progression of thought, practical proportion of the historical materials to be submitted, and, withal, an air of domestic quiet and peace that pervaded the whole. The reader felt that a Christian home had been the making of the hero of the Reformation, and his monumental labors had resulted, in no inconsiderable degree, in the rearing of Christian homes and the embellishing of Christian home-life. The proposition of Dr. Buchwald was made advisedly. In his pastoral labors the author had represtinated at one time the pious endeavor of Luther's first biographer, who preached sermons on the life of Luther to his congregation at Joachimsthal. Dr. Buchwald did the same, and learned to know the intense interest which Luther's life can arouse in the common people, and the blessed results accruing in the life and conduct of laymen from a contemplation and application of the lessons of the life of the hero of their faith. He can introduce the present second edition of his work, which has been brought up to the level of the modern knowledge of Luther, and embodies the results of the latest research, with the assurance: *Expersto crede Ruperto!* To the host of readers who have perused this classic of the Christian home literature of Protestantism we would add our humble testimony, and assert its eminent usefulness for preparing the masses in our churches for an intelligent, appreciative, and enthusiastic celebration of the quadricentennial of the Reformation in 1917. Fifteen artistically executed plates, copied from acknowledged masters, and 120 illustrations, embodied in the text, enliven the pages and make the book attractive to the common people, who never grow away from the child's love for illustrations. In the presentation which the author has made of the facts in the Reformer's life, little is to be noted. The incident at Pilate's Stairs in Rome is accepted as genuine (p. 67 f.), so is the finding of a complete Bible in the library at Erfurt (p. 38), both of which incidents are discredited in our day. The account of Luther's dealings with the peasants is just to Luther (p. 287 f.), and the account of the Marburg Colloquy, though comparatively brief, does not disguise the main point of difference between Lutheran and Reformed teaching on the Lord's Supper.

D.